The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel

Nolan, Brian M

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Published by the Biblical Institute of the University
of Fribourg Switzerland
and the Seminar für Biblische Zeitgeschichte
of the University of Münster i. W. Federal Republic of Germany
Editor: Othmar Keel
Coeditors: Bernard Trémel and Erich Zenger

The Author:

Brian M. Nolan graduated in Modern Languages from University College Dublin in 1956. For the following five years he studied theology in Ireland and Rome, and was awarded the Licentiate in Theology by the Angelicum, Rome, in 1961. In 1963 he received the Licentiate in Sacred Scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute. He taught Scripture in the Irish Vincentian Scholasticate from 1963 to 1968. The following year was spent in post-graduate study at the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Française at Jerusalem. In 1969–1970 he did course work and further research for the doctorate in the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. He was awarded a Doctorate in Divinity (S.T.D.) by this University in 1975. Since 1971 he has been a Lecturer in Biblical Studies and Fundamental Theology at All Hallows Missionary College, Dublin. He has also been a visiting lecturer at St. Patrick's College of Education and Holy Cross College, in Dublin; and at the Pontifical University of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS 23

BRIAN M. NOLAN

THE ROYAL SON OF GOD

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF MATTHEW 1–2 IN THE SETTING OF THE GOSPEL

ÉDITIONS UNIVERSITAIRES FRIBOURG SUISSE
VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT GÖTTINGEN
1979

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Nolan, Brian M.:
The royal Son of God. –
Fribourg/Suisse: Editions Universitaires;
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

1979
(Orbis biblicus et orientalis; 23)
ISBN 3-7278-0206-5 (Editions Universitaires)
ISBN 3-525-53328-4 (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht)

Publication subsidized by the Fribourg University Council,
Fribourg, Switzerland

Τὴν Ἐδὲμ Βηθλεὲμ ἤνοιξε, δεῦτε ἴδωμεν·
τὴν τρυφὴν ἐν κρυφῇ ηὕραμεν, δεῦτε λάβωμεν
τὰ τοῦ παραδείσου ἐντὸς τοῦ σπηλαίου·
ἐκεῖ ἐφάνη ῥίζα ἀπότιστος βλαστάνουσα ἄφεσιν,
ἐκεῖ ηὑρέθη φρέαρ ἀνόρυκτον,
οὗ πιεῖν Δαβὶδ πρὶν ἐπεθύμησεν·
ἐκεῖ παρθένος τεκοῦσα βρέφος·
τὴν δίψαν ἔπαυσεν εὐθὺς τὴν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τοῦ Δαβίδ·
διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τοῦτο ἐπειχθῶμεν, ποῦ ἐτέχθη
: παιδίον νέον; ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων θεός :

Bethlehem has thrown open the way to Eden: come, let us see;
we have found delight in a hidden place: come, let us share
in that paradise within the cave.
There has appeared a root no man watered, flowering forgiveness;
there is found a well no man has dug,
from which David once yearned to drink (2 Samuel 23:15).
There a virgin has given birth to a child
and straightway slaked the thirst both of Adam and of David.
Wherefore let us hurry to that place where has been born
a tiny child - who is God for ever!

(First *Kontakion* on the Nativity by St. Romanos Melodus, who was born in Syria about 490 A.D.
This opening of the rhythmic sermon is chanted in the Greek Church at Matins on Christmas Day)

CHRISTO CONIUNCTIS
NOTIS ATQUE IGNOTIS
- IMPRIMIS VERO PARENTIBUS -
QUI MIHI FIDEM CORDIS ALUERUNT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This book grew out of a doctoral dissertation, which was partially researched during 1968-1969 in the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem, and was completed under the guidance of Professor Ceslas Spicq at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. It was defended in May 1975.

The published form is notably shorter, due to the appearance in the interim of cognate studies by George M. Soares Prabhu (1976) and Raymond E. Brown (1977). These obviate the need to repeat what is therein so cogently expressed. The excisions and abbreviations have allowed the development and lengthening of the essential Part III. The whole work has been thoroughly recast and rewritten in order to integrate studies appearing up to the Summer of 1978.

The author cannot record all the assistance received. However, three Dominican friars may be thanked as representative benefactors: Pierre Benoit, the late Roland de Vaux, and Ceslas Spicq.

Gratitude must be expressed to the Vincentian Congregation for its manifold support of the writer during the years while this study was maturing. The editors of the Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis kindly invited this book into their Series, and smoothed its technical preparation. The contributions towards the cost of publication made by this Series and by Le Conseil de l'Université are gratefully recorded.

The author is aware that his most basic debts cannot be acknowledged in writing, but only in the ceaseless effort to share in what T. S. Eliot, in *The Elder Statesman* Act II, called the

> love that's lived in
> But not looked at, love within the light of which
> All else is seen, the love within which
> All other love finds speech.
> This love is silent.

All Hallows Missionary College,
Dublin 9.

January 25th, 1979

INTRODUCTION

Gospel christology is often understood as synonymous with an analysis of such titles of Jesus as Lord, Christ, King, Son of God, Son of Man, Son of David, Shepherd, Servant, and Prophet. Whereas these titles are rarely coordinated by exegetes, this study of Matthew is an attempt to shape a synthesis. It claims that the royal, Davidic, theology integrates all the forenamed roles, without necessarily exhausting their meaning. The Christ of Matthew is Lord of the heart. Only through immersion in the Gospel's royalist faith-vision can the various colours of the christological spectrum, as caught by the titles, coalesce into the glory that captivated the evangelist.

Three concentric circles could represent the structure of the present book. Part I is the outermost circle, comprising the first three Chapters, and dealing with the religious milieu of the evangelist. His precise sources can no longer be identified. Even if they could be isolated, they are so refashioned by Matthew that the raw material is of minor importance. More significant is the formative influence of the Hebrew Bible and the Apocrypha. In Chapter 2 patriarchal, exodus, exile, and, specially, Davidic resonance is detected. But, as Chapter 3 indicates, one cannot speak of an "Old" Testament for the early Church (if at all!). The Hebrew Bible shaped a mentality and a life-style, a *Hermeneutik* of existence. This midrashic factor is the dynamism of the evangelist's living Bible.

The second, inner, circle is made up of Part II, Chapters 4 and 5. It concentrates on the immediate Gospel setting of Matthew 1-2. The milieu of the evangelist is explored, as well as the cohesion and drama of his work. Special attention is devoted to the intentional paschal overtones of his two opening chapters.

However, the innermost circle is constituted by Part III, Chapters 6 and 7. This is the core of the work, and accounts for more than half its length. Aided by the findings of Parts I and II, the sixth Chapter treats

the Gospel of the Origins (Matthew 1-2) as communicating the Christ indirectly, that is, through the impact he made on his disciples or opponents. This soteriological presentation of the Messiah is termed "participatory" or "covenant" christology, since it involves and transforms the believers.

Finally, the lengthy Chapter 7 penetrates the devotion, the living faith, of first century Judaism and Christianity. A vibrant kingship mystique is traced in what may be dubbed the "Davidic canon". This canon obviously embraces Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and the Psalms. Yet it must be extended to include Isaiah, Deutero-Zechariah, and the Song and Wisdom of Solomon. Indeed, elements of a refined dynastic theology are discernible in the environment of the First Evangelist, namely, at Qumran, and in Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and the Psalms and Odes of Solomon.

Using this royalist faith as a hermeneutic key, the entire Gospel of Matthew is passed in review. The evangelist's vision of Jesus the Prophet-King yields fresh life and meaning. His saintly ruler and Bridegroom of Israel has a mission to all twelve tribes, which he exercises through his regal wisdom and prayer, his Solomonic exorcisms and healings, and his royal shepherding and feeding. To this King belong the unique divine sonship, the spirit of God, the renewal of the covenant, and the glory of Zion. He is surrounded by his courtiers Peter, Judas, and even Asaph. The parables of banquet, vineyard, and judgment, the Temple theme, and the Passion of the Shepherd-King, also gain vitality in this ethos of Matthew 3-28. Then Matthew 1-2 is studied in the light of the foregoing broad basis of the royal theology in the rest of the Gospel.

Finally, the divine sonship of Jesus the Christ is focused in the light of the blessed covenant with David. Underlying some parts of the Hebrew Bible is a mythical pattern of creation and primordial wisdom revolving around the righteous king, who saves his people, builds a Temple as the centre of the world, and possesses the spirit of Yahweh and "eternal" life. In Matthew, and elsewhere in the New Testament, this pattern fosters a mystical perception of God in Christ, of God as the Christ. Perhaps this "language" was partially forged and experienced in the fervour of the Tabernacles and New Year celebration of the Davidic Messiah, the veritable royal Son of God.[1]

---

1 See the detailed summary on pages 241-245, especially n. 1 on page 244.

P A R T I

T H E R E L I G I O U S B A C K G R O U N D

O F M A T T H E W 1 - 2

PART I

THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND OF MATTHEW 1 - 2

CHAPTER 1

THE POSSIBLE SOURCES OF MATTHEW 1-2

A. THE QUEST FOR THE SOURCES

Salisbury cathedral still raises its spire in blessing over the water-meadows. If the art lover can discover the vantage point of John Constable a century and a half ago, a similar view may be enjoyed. The modern spectator well may wonder if the physical reality, the source of Constable's landscape, is as evocative as the painting. "The trees and clouds still seem to ask me to try to do something like them." The alchemy of the artist has infused a mood and a measure which normally escapes the less perceptive eye of the amateur. The same experience holds good for portraiture, where the artificial canvas can be more true to life than the unsparing exposure of the newsreel camera. Analogously, if Matthew's presumed sources were extant, it may be doubted that they would suffice to isolate his faith and flair. The stratigraphy descried by literary archaeology tells of a dead age. The evangelist's hypothetical traditions rose to a new life in his Gospel, which far excelled their original state. The quest for the stories and even writings he may have inherited is, consequently, not as important as the appreciation of the finished work.

Two tendencies may be distinguished among those who have sought to identify the sources of Matthew's two opening chapters. Some see the tradition received by the evangelist as predominant, whereas others lay more

stress on his editing and creativity. The following scholars emphasize the role of tradition in approximately this order of increasing stress: G. D. Kilpatrick,[1] H. Räisänen,[2] W. L. Knox,[3] and G. Strecker.[4] On the other hand, the evangelist is seen progressively more at work by R. Bultmann,[5]

---

1 *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford, 1946), e.g., pp. 52-55, 93. He holds the evangelist received the quotations and their introductions, and at least the kernels of the stories, but that he submitted this material to a more thorough rewriting than was his wont.

2 *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Tom. 158; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1969) 52-54: Matthew is responsible for at least the *Umgestaltung* of the genealogy; the Joseph cycle was already formed in oral tradition; it contained the virginal conception, and presented Jesus as a new Moses and Jacob-Israel. The magi episode was originally independent, and the slaughter at Bethlehem was joined to it before Matthew. Räisänen admits the difficulty of identifying the hand of Matthew, but accepts that he shortened what he received by selecting and accentuating what appealed to him, e.g. the Davidic sonship in 1:18-25 (p. 64 with n. 2).

3 *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Volume II, *St. Luke and St. Matthew* (ed. H. Chadwick; Cambridge: University Press, 1957) 121-128: the main outlines of the stories were already fixed, the original substratum being the three Joseph stories (1:18-25; 2:13-15, 19-23). Mt 1:18-25 was revised from an original birth story to a defense of Joseph's refusal to divorce Mary. Mt 1:19 may come from Matthew. The five fulfilment formula quotations came from a collection of fulfilment texts, whose secondary theme seems to have been the parallel between Jesus and Moses. The length of Mt 2:2 suggests a conflation of two earlier stories about (1) Herod, the star, consultation, and massacre; and (2) the visit of the magi. The Herod and Joseph cycles were probably joined before Matthew. He may have added the magi in the course of his usual editorial revision.

4 *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (2d ed.; Göttingen, 1966) 51-55: Matthew's editing is restricted to historicizing additions about time and place in 1:18a and 2:1a, and parts of 1:16. Mt 2 is stamped as a unit by the progressive chronology (K. L. Schmidt), the interrelation of verses 7 and 16 (G. Erdmann), and the elements of the Moses story: annunciations to the king and father, dreams, magicians, persecution, escape by means of the parents. It is homogeneous with Mt 1: stress on father, apparitions, and traces of Matthew's style throughout. Matthew inherited, but did not develop, the Moses-Christ typology. There is no apologetic thrust.

5 *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1968) 291-296, 304, 443-444: the numerical structuring of the genealogy was in the source (p. 357); 1:18-25 was originally a messianic annunciation to the "son of David," with 1:22-23 added. Matthew probably shaped 2:1-23 from oral or written tradition, awkwardly combining the Nazareth and Bethlehem stories. The magi and the massacre were originally independent. The flight and the return were apparently in the sources. The motif of the virgin birth, and the stories of the magi and the slaughter of the infants, are of Hellenistic Jewish(-Christian) provenance.

M. Dibelius,[1] C. T. Davis,[2] G. M. Soares Prabhu,[3] R. E. Brown,[4] and

---

1 *Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind* (Heidelberg, 1932) 24-26, 44-45: Matthew inherited the *Personallegende* of 2:1-12, and the *Legende* about the preservation of the child in 2:13-21. He adds 1:18-25 as a narrative defense of Mary's chastity, and 2:22-23 to introduce Nazareth. Like Bultmann, Dibelius believes that Matthew has integrated the traditions of Mt 2, yet he seems to go further in positing that it was the evangelist who first linked the magi story with the flight and massacre. He deduces that the magi and star narrative once circulated independently of the Herod cycle, because Joseph does not appear in 2:1-12, and the episode climaxes in adoration, without any need of a bloody sequel. The redactional link in 2:1 shows he joined Mt 1 and 2 (compare Bultmann, *History*, 292; and contrast Strecker, *Weg*, 53-54).
Similar to Dibelius is G. Erdmann, *Die Vorgeschichten des Lukas- und Matthäusevangeliums und Vergils vierte Ekloge* (FRLANT [NF] 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1932) 53-67. See the judicious review by A. Fridrichsen, *TLZ* 22 (1935), cols. 398-401.

2 "Tradition and Redaction in Matthew 1:18-2:23," *JBL* 90 (1971) 404-421. Davis examines the Matthean editing more closely than any author yet mentioned, and summarizes: "The tradition furnishing the basic sub-structure of Matthew 1-2 is composed of four narrative units: (1) 1:18-21, 24-25; (2) 2:1-2 (in part), 9b, 11; (3) 2:13-15a; and (4) 2:19-21" (p. 421). He has missed some features of Matthew's composition, e.g., the obedience formula in 1:24-25, and the use of ἀναχωρέω (though see pp. 408-409). He does not pay sufficient attention to the Davidic or Mosaic colouring, or to the possibility that Isa 7:14 was connected with the conception of Jesus before Matthew.
Note the general agreement of the findings of W. O. Walker, "A Method for Identifying Redactional Passages in Matthew on Functional and Linguistic Grounds," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 76-93, at p. 82 n. 13: Mt 1:1, 17, 18a, 22-23; 2:1a, 5b-6, 15b, 17-18, 23b are redactional.

3 *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew. An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1-2* (AnBib 63; Rome, 1976). This is the most thorough and satisfactory analysis to date. The work is too lengthy for summary. He evaluates previous studies on pp. 163-164 and 189-191. In two folding charts at the end he sets out clearly Matthew's redaction and reformulation of three sources: the Dream-Narrative, 1:18-25, 2:13-15, and 2:19-23; the Magi, 2:(1-2) 9b-12; Herod, 2:(1-2) 3-9a, 16-18. But, what could be the purpose of the Dream-Narrative? was Herod independent?

4 *The Birth of the Messiah. A commentary on the infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke* (New York, 1977). Brown explains his methodology for distinguishing tradition from editing on pp. 105-108, concluding that, "the probabilities converge to suggest a pre-Matthean narrative pattern on the infancy of Moses and built around angelic dream appearances to Joseph" (p. 108). Wisely eschewing the disengagement of received material from Matthean wording (pp. 111, 119, 192 n. 33), Brown reconstructs the main pre-Matthean narrative on pp. 109 and 192. Unlike Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 293), Brown inclines to the view that the magi and Herod stories were joined before Matthew adopted them (see pp. 192 n. 38, 196 n. 52, and 229 n. 45).

A. Vögtle.[1] Others, such as A. Paul[2] and M. D. Goulder,[3] appear to consider the opening two chapters of Matthew as the creation of the evangelist, probably with the assistance of his Beth Midrash.

---

1 *Messias und Gottessohn. Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte* (Theologische Perspektiven; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971) 16-27, 54-60, 81-88: Mt 1 stems entirely from the evangelist; Mt 2, except the quotations, had an extensive "Mosaic" *Vorlage*.

2 *L'évangile de l'Enfance selon saint Matthieu* (Lire la Bible, 17; Paris: 1968), passim. Paul identifies Matthew's community as a group of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians in the extreme north of Galilee, who are considered heretics by the ambient Pharisaic Jewry (pp. 7, 123-124; cf. pp. 138, 174-175). The Matthean study group shaped the two literary units of Mt 1-2: (1) The genealogy, whose verse 16b is commented on by the three Joseph stories, 1:18-25; 2:1a, 13b-15; 2:19-23, which are built on the same model, although the first is more elaborate because of its special relation to the genealogy (pp. 141-145, 171); βύβλος γενέσεως originally introduced the genealogy and the Joseph triptych; and (2) the second unit consists of the magi episode and its aftermath, 2:1b-12, 16-18. The contemporary interpretation of Num 22-24, with its Mosaic and Egypt slant, influenced this unit (pp. 100-115, 158-161). Paul shows little interest in any sources of Mt, other than scripture and its exegesis at the time (though he admits 2:6 may come from a "montage pré-mathéen," p. 129). His valid comment on the biblical sources of the genealogy he would probably extend to 1:18-2:23: "Les sources perdent leur valeur originale et se trouvent intégrées dans une construction harmonieuse au sein de laquelle chaque élément joue un rôle en fonction de tout l'ensemble" (p. 29). In practice, Paul suggests just three expressions in Mt 1-2 which draw on specific OT contexts: "the book of the genealogy" (p. 100, cf. pp. 39-40, 46-47); the star (pp. 100-103); and Egypt (pp. 153-161). Apparently Paul considers Matthew's non-biblical sources to be either unascertainable or insignificant. Up to a point, this is quite true. It is impossible to distinguish sharply between tradition and redaction in these chapters. What the evangelist omitted from his putative sources will never be known. The most important aspect of any such source is the fact that the Gospel writer retained and developed at least part of it (cf. Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 80).
Paul's presuppositions are unclear. He may view Mt 1-2 as *fides quaerens intellectum*, in the sense that Matthew's research team would have had faith in the risen Messiah and the OT, as then understood, to body forth that faith in his origins, but no significant traditional material. O. L. Cope (*A Scribe Trained* [see below in n. 1 on p. 23], 90) cautiously proposes that Matthew worked forward in 1:1-25 to his tradition in 2:1-12, and outward from it in 2:13-23.

3 *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London, 1974) 228-242: only the name Joseph is traditional in 1:1-17; 1:18-25 is a midrash on Gen 17, Isa 7:14, and the dreamer Joseph of Genesis; 2:1-15 and 16-23 are elaborations of the lectionary readings Gen 25:19-28:8 and 28:9-31, respectively.
Compare the implications of J. Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel. A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976) 120-128.

B. THE RESULT OF THIS QUEST

The outcome depends on the four-pronged method employed. Vertical analysis (identification of the specifically Matthean by means of a comparison of Matthew 1-2 with the characteristic style and interests of chapters 3-28) complements horizontal analysis (deducing the evangelist's tradition from parallels in kindred contemporary literature, both canonical and extra-canonical). Apparent inconsistencies in the narrative imply the weaving together of received material. Lastly, the adaptation of the context to the mainly redactional fulfilment formula quotations indicates that the former pre-dates the scriptural commentary. This methodology has led to something resembling a consensus regarding the extent of the sources of Matthew among C. T. Davis, G. M. Soares Prabhu, and R. E. Brown.[1]

This procedure is eminently logical. However, the evidence of the Gospel is too limited to allow a high degree of conviction about the precise extent of the redaction. Also, Matthew's interests are reflected in what he is deemed to have taken over from others, as well as in what he added or created.[2] But the main limitation of this approach is its concentration on the literary aspects, rather than on the Gospel's vibrant, if fluid, midrashic texture and affective élan. Separation of Matthew 1-2 into its putative constituent strands destroys the pattern of the tapestry. It would appear that the writer has so shaped his composition that a *fixed* oral or written source (sources?) - if any - has taken on a new life in what will later be seen as its Matthean frame of predominantly Davidic reference.[3] It is entirely possible that appreciation of the midrashic texture of Matthew 1-2 would reveal connections between what are at first

---

1 Note the disagreement of Soares Prabhu with Davis in *Formula Quotations*, 184 n. 71, 191, 241-242; and of Brown with Soares Prabhu, in his review of the latter's work in *JBL* 96 (1977) 602-603. On the following pages there is a very hypothetical reconstruction of Matthew's tradition(s).

2 Compare R. H. Gundry, *JBL* 92 (1973) 138-139.

3 This principle of the absolute priority of the final text is espoused by W. G. Thompson, "An Historical Perspective in the Gospel of Matthew," *JBL* 93 (1974) 243-262, 244 n. 2. Cf. X. Léon-Dufour in a review of Soares Prabhu's *Formula Quotations*, *RSR* 64 (1976) 430: "suffit-il d'avoir établi l'histoire d'un texte pour en dégager le sens?"; and Brown (*Messiah*, 119): "In no sense are the reconstructed pre-Matthean elements with all their uncertainties comparable in importance to the final Matthean narrative, the only compositional stage for which we have surety."

sight disparate elements of diverse provenance. For instance, the symbol of the star and its rising (ἀνατολή, נצר, צמח)[1] reaches back to Joseph who dreamed of stars and was hounded to death by his brothers (Genesis 37:7-9, 18-20), to Herod-Balak and the enlightened magus at the time of leaving Egypt in Numbers 22-24, and just possibly to the birth of the Jerusalem king in Psalm 110:3.[2] The same symbol could even embrace the mourning of Joseph's mother Rachel over her children in Matthew 2:18, and Nazareth/ *Neṣer*eth in Galilee, the region of messianic light and universal dominion (see Matthew 4:14-16).[3] Again, Justin Martyr's use of Isaiah 7-8, which may have been shared by Matthew, integrates the main elements of the two opening chapters of the First Gospel: Herod the "Assyrian" foe, the gentile magi, and the (Davidic) son of the virgin.[4]

Conscious of the inevitable uncertainty, and restricted utility, of isolating Matthew's sources, the following maximalist narrative may be proposed - with great hesitation - as containing the elements familiar to the evangelist from his milieu:

> Mary the mother of Jesus was betrothed to Joseph. Before they began to live together, she was discovered to be pregnant. Joseph decided to divorce her. While he was in this frame of mind an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream saying, "Joseph, do not be afraid to take Mary your wife, since what is generated in her is of the holy spirit. You will call the child Jesus." So Joseph rose from sleep and took his wife. She bore a son, and he called his name Jesus.
>
> Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the time of King Herod. Now magi came from the East saying they saw his star as it rose. Herod was agitated, and enquired of the chief priests and scribes where the Christ would be born. They told him, in Bethlehem of Judaea, as the prophets had written. Herod questioned the magi about the time of the appearance of the star, and sent them to Bethlehem to find the child and report back to him.
>
> The star they had seen as it rose went before them, until it came to a standstill over where the child was. Seeing the star they greatly rejoiced. On their arrival at the house they saw the child

---

1 On the web of messianic hopes woven around the star and the branch which would arise see later on pp. 43-44, 73-74, 190-191, 209, and 212-214.

2 Cf. pp. 209 n. 1 and 233 n. 3.

3 Granted a generous midrashic intuition, the Joseph and royal star complex can integrate the fulfilment formula quotations in 1:23; 2:15, 18, 23; as well as 2:6. In this connection Isaiah is the "Fifth Gospel."

4 For the references in Justin, and the possibility of a pre-Matthean "Hezekian" messianology, see below on pp. 206-209.

with Mary its mother. They bowed down, and opened their treasures, and offered him gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Warned in a dream, they returned directly to their home country.

When they had left, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream saying, "Get up, take the child and its mother, and go for safety into Egypt. Remain there until I tell you, because Herod is trying to liquidate the child." Joseph got up and took the child and its mother down to Egypt, and remained there until the death of Herod.

Herod was furious when he realized the magi had given him the slip. He sent and had killed all the Bethlehem infants aged two years and under, in accordance with the time he had ascertained from the magi.

When Herod had died an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt saying, "Get up, take the child and its mother, and go to the Land of Israel, for those who sought the life of the child have died." Joseph got up and took the child and its mother, and entered the Land of Israel. Hearing that Archelaus had succeeded his father Herod to power in Judaea, he was afraid to go there. Warned in a dream, he went to Nazareth in Galilee.

Nevertheless, this proposed source material is metamorphosed in the final version. For this reason, and others mentioned on page 20, the titles of Chapters 2 and 3 prescind from unobtainable certainty about traditional data. They concentrate on the "resonance" of Old Testament and Jewish religious experience, that is, on the wider question of what the evangelist probably absorbed from his faith community. His Christian milieu is probed in the fourth chapter, and some main lines of the Gospel that emerged from interaction with it in chapter five. The last two chapters, six and seven, try to capture the vitality of the royal mystique suffusing Matthew 1-2.

CHAPTER 2

THE OLD TESTAMENT RESONANCE OF MATTHEW 1-2

Matthew's Gospel of the Origins is impregnated with allusions to the Old Testament. They are the common language of faith, and require to be treated before the formal commentary provided by the five explicit quotations. A scriptural allusion may be defined as a conscious evocation of an Old Testament personage, event, institution, passage, or literary technique, made by the writer in order to communicate through the medium of received religious tradition. No clearly defined set of rules can be given for gauging the precise influence of an Old Testament theme, passage, or reality, on an apparent parallel in Matthew.[1] But two criteria are certainly valid. For that influence to be highly significant, there must be both a series of verbal similarities between the texts, and a theological motive giving them some coherence and direction.[2]

---

1 But note the helpful considerations of J. A. E. van Dodewaard, "La force évocatrice de la citation mise en lumière en prenant pour base l'Évangile de Saint Matthieu," *Bib* 36 (1955) 482-491. His treatment is accepted and related to general literary theory by L. Hartman, "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of Matthew and the Problem of Communication," *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier; Gembloux, 1972) 131-152, esp. pp. 133-137 and 146-147. The complexity of appreciating an allusion is well illustrated by F. Martin, "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Matthew," *ScEs* 27 (1975) 261-301, esp. pp. 261-270. The contribution of OT allusions in four passages of Matthew is instructively evaluated by O. Lamar Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* (CBQMS 5; Washington, 1976) 95-120.

2 Compare M. D. Goulder, *JTS* 9 (1958) 338-339; I. Gomá Civit, *El Evangelio según Mateo* (Madrid, 1966), 1. 6. Concerning the theological motive note the valid principle of M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash, and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 29-82, p. 66: "The [first century] context of any Scripture text is rather the whole of Scripture and contemporary needs." On the vitality of these allusions see P. Beauchamp, "La figure dans l'un et l'autre Testament," *RSR* 59 (1971) 209-224; P. Grech, "The Old Testament as a Christological Source in the Apostolic Age," *BTB* 5 (1975) 127-145, esp. p. 134 n. 13; L. Sabourin, "The Bible and Christ: The Unity of the Two Testaments," *BTB* 8 (1978) 77-85, esp. pp. 79-80 on Mt 1:1-17. See further p. 85 n. 3 below.

A. SCRIPTURAL ALLUSIONS IN MATTHEW 1:1-17

The opening words, Βύβλος γενέσεως, evoke the opening chapters of the Bible.[1] The mention of the creative spirit in Mt 1:18b and 20b has led many to posit a Matthean theology of a new creation, perhaps even of a new Adam.[2] Further support is sought in a suggested analogy between the two accounts of creation in Genesis 1-3 and the two parts of Matthew 1. The regular rhythm of the genealogy is thought to echo the six days of the priestly preface to Genesis. The Yahwist's vivid account of the creation of Adam and Eve is likened to the snatch of biography in Mt 1:18-25.[3]

Certainly the notion of a Matthean new creation inaugurated in Jesus, the firstborn of redeemed mankind, is attractive. But it has no solid basis. The spirit of God (not Matthew's "holy spirit") appears only in Genesis 1:2. The thirty-nine verses which intervene between this and the βύβλος γενέσεως of Genesis 2:4 treat of creation by divine command, not by the divine spirit. Indeed, "spirit" (רוח, πνεῦμα) is found neither in Hebrew nor in Greek in the Yahwist narrative of Genesis 2-3, not even in 2:7, where it might be expected when the Lord God infuses the breath of life into Adam. In contrast to Genesis 1, the spirit is absent from

---

1 The parallel with Genesis is not exact, since in each case the latter has Αὕτη ἡ βύβλος γενέσεως and οὐρανου καὶ γῆς (Gen 2:4) or ἀνθρώπων (Gen 5:1; אדם in Hebrew). Βύβλος γενέσεως in the Septuagint, therefore, differs from Mt 1:1 both by being qualified, and by not being linked to a personal name. See further in M. D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies* (SNTSMS 8; Cambridge, 1969) 148-149.

2 E.g., W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1964) 67-72, although he admits that fulfilment of prophecy is more central to the narrative than the new creation motif (p. 70); Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 36-41, 46-48; D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (New Century Bible; London, 1972) 75 ("possible"); T. Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel* (London: SCM, 1973) 146.

3 Cf. Davies, *Setting*, 71-72; A. Feuillet, "L'Esprit Saint et la Mère du Christ," *BSocFrEtMar* 25, Tome I, *L'évangile et les Pères* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1968) 39-64, at pp. 41-42; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 48, with the tableau on p. 46.

Brown (*Messiah*, 140 n. 21) considers that the mention of the Spirit came to Mt indirectly from early christology, and that any specific OT background it may have evoked escapes us; also, "While I believe that Matthew understands the action of the Holy Spirit in the begetting of Jesus as a creative rather than a sexual action, I hesitate to use the analogy between Matt 1 and Gen 1-2 to argue that Matthew is thinking of the Spirit of God that moved over the waters in Gen 1:2."

Matthew's genealogy, although it is active in the proposed parallel to the Yahwist creation story, Matthew 1:18-25. Matthew does not hesitate to mention the creative activity of the Spirit in 1:18b and 20b. Therefore, its absence from the genealogy indicates he is not proclaiming a new Genesis. Also, whereas the genealogy of Genesis 5 follows the creation and the spirit of Genesis 1, it precedes them in Matthew. Consequently, the parallel proposed between Genesis 1 and Matthew 1 is not verified in the text. How far the idea of a new creation is from the opening of the First Gospel is revealed by the absence of Adam and of God from the genealogy, and by the unemphatic first mention of the holy spirit in Matthew 1:18b. This implies that the pericope does not focus precisely on the begetting from the spirit. In Matthew 1:1-17 history has reached its promised climax. But this is rather the fruition of the old and the inauguration of the last times, than a wholly new creation headed by a new Adam. The Messiah is the son of Abraham and of David, rather than the son of Adam.[1]

The first fourteen names in the genealogy are found in 1 Chronicles 1: 34; 2:1-5, 9-15; with perhaps ten names from the final verses of Ruth, 4:18-22. The second block of fourteen names occurs in 1 Chronicles 3:5, 10-16. Of the third set of fourteen names, only three appear in 1 Chronicles 3:17-19.[2]

---

1 This interpretation does not at all exclude the idea of the creative Spirit at work in the origins of Jesus the Messiah. See W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (THKNT 1; Berlin, 1968) 67-68; M. E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit* (Heythrop Monographs, 1; London, 1976) 119-121; H. C. Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key to the Gospel according to Matthew," *JBL* 95 (1976) 224, 228-229. What is denied is a Matthean transposition of Gen 1 in his opening chapter. Compare the view of H. Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Tom. 158; Helsinki, 1969) 61 n. 1. In later passages peculiar to Matthew, the notion of a new creation is as rooted in the generations of Israel (not in Gen 1-3) as it is in Mt 1. The apocalyptic renewal of Israel under the followers of the glorified Son of Man is for Mt 19:28, alone of the evangelists, the παλιγγενεσία. The equally apocalyptic resurrection of the saints of Israel follows on his resurrection, and significantly, his imparting of the Spirit - ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (Mt 27:50-53). See also, D. Senior, "The Death of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Holy Ones (Mt 27:51-53)," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 325-329; W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (AB 26; New York, 1971) 350-353.

2 The dependence on 1 Chronicles is clearly set out by L. Sabourin, *Il vangelo di Matteo* (Marino, 1975), 1.193, 195-196. The significance of the number fourteen, and of Matthew's additions to, and omissions from, the Chronicler's lists, will be treated later on pp. 59-61, and 204.

Form criticism has contributed little to the classification and understanding of biblical genealogies.[1] Marshall D. Johnson's study of their function in the Pentateuch, Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, Matthew, Luke, and post-biblical Judaism has shed some light.[2] He concludes that in the Old Testament period "the genealogical form was used in a variety of ways, but above all for apologetic purposes, both nationalistic and theological"; and that it was "especially suited for apologetic purposes accomplished by midrashic exegesis." Unfortunately, he does not probe the anthropological function of genealogies, and does not furnish a very precise classification of their various types. The following scheme, however, does not do violence to the pre-Christian data.

The Old Testament genealogies serve three main purposes:
1) Identification - in the Old Testament this was almost confined to the efforts of Ezra-Nehemiah to establish racial purity, to determine the true Israelite, but in post-biblical Judaism it became a dominant concern;[3]
2) Legitimation - a function which was vital only for cultic officials, and which was hardly requisite in the case of the Messiah;[4]

---

1 See C. Westermann, *Genesis* (BKAT 1/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1966) 12; R. R. Wilson, "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research," *JBL* 94 (1975) 169-189, esp. pp. 179-182.

2 *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies*. The two following quotations are from pp. 81, 139. His adjective "apologetic" is better understood in the didactic rather than the polemical sense. Note the apposite criticism by Wilson, "Old Testament Genealogies," 173; and by Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key," 205-206.

3 Significantly, the last of the four sections of J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London, 1969), is devoted to "The Maintenance of Racial Purity" (pp. 269-358). The genealogy of Num 26 belongs here, since it shows that the people about to enter the Promised Land is identical with the sons of Abraham in Egypt in Gen 46. However, the frame verses and the numerical scheme of Matthew's genealogy suggest a wider interest than sheer identification.

4 See Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 79-80, 115-131. Messianic speculations were so varied and amorphous that membership of the house of David could not have been an essential criterion for discerning the legitimate Messiah. Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1927), 2.323-376; S. Talmon, "Typen der Messiaserwartung um die Zeitenwende," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. W. Wolff; München, 1971) 571-588. First century messianic expectation, as distinct from speculation, was, of course, for the son of David; cf. G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London, 1973) 130-134.

3) Organization - a role with three aspects: political, historical, and doctrinal. For example, the Yahwist tribal genealogies in Genesis have the political aim of defining the relationships of the peoples inhabiting the Palestine area; and the seventy nations of Genesis 10 extend this classification to the whole known world. Secondly, the priestly system of genealogies (the toledoth book) enables some sort of coherent history to be written spanning the centuries which have left no records or merely a few unconnected stories, for instance, the era between Adam and Abraham. Later these genealogies coordinate the patriarchs by establishing family relationships, and divide the centuries into epochs by recondite chronological speculation, whose principles are poorly understood. The third type of genealogical organization, that elaborated for directly doctrinal purposes, is the most relevant to Matthew. In the Pentateuch the priestly toledoth are very probably a technique for conveying how the dynamism of the divine blessing in Genesis 1:28 and 9:1 and 7 animates the later experience of Israel. Such a function would explain why Abraham is not provided with a toledoth formula, since he is viewed rather as the man of the Genesis 17 covenant than as the inheritor of the creation blessing.[1] Abraham marks the beginning of Israel's responsibility for itself and for all mankind. Consequently, Matthew 1:1-3 resembles the priestly writer of Genesis by opening with the man of the covenant, Abraham, and continuing the tale of the promise through royal Judah. Matthew 1:4-16 reflects the outlook of the successors of P responsible for 1 Chronicles 1-9.[2] These genealogies share the theology of the whole work in describing how the

---

1 For this interpretation see P. Weimar, "Die Toledot-Formel in der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung," *BZ* 18 (1974) 65-93, esp. pp. 89-90. Independently of Weimar, the centrality of the creation blessing to P was developed by W. Brueggemann, "The Kerygma of the Priestly Writers," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 297-413, esp. pp. 398 n. 9, 412-413. In connection with Mt 1, Brueggemann's references to this blessing being expressed in Davidic terms are worth noting (pp. 405 n. 29, 407 n. 34, 409 n. 39). On the Pentateuchal genealogies see further, Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 3-36; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973) 301-305.

2 For the use of 1 Chron 1-9 in Mt 1:1-17 cf. H. Frankemölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi* (NTAbh 10; Münster, 1974) 314-318; and also, M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London, 1974) 228-230.

generations lead up to the establishment of the kingdom of Yahweh, which is centred on Jerusalem and its temple worship, presided over by the Davidic prophet-king, and which embraces all Israel and is sympathetic to the righteous Gentile.[1] Phrases applied to 1 Chronicles 1-9 are equally true of Matthew, whose genealogy may be called a "sermon" on the privileges of the messianic people[2], and a "panegyric" on David.[3]

Consequently, Matthew's genealogy, in so far as it depends on the Old Testament rather than on the first century environment and the theology of the author, does not primarily aim at identifying Jesus as a Jew, a son of Abraham, and a Davidic prince. Neither does it seek to legitimate him as the Messiah. Matthew 1:1-17 is essentially a hymn to the continuity and invincibility of the grace of Yahweh. It is a kerygma. The genealogy proclaims the fidelity and consistency of the God of the covenants with Abraham and David. It proclaims Jesus as the Christ, the sole, predestined heir to the ancestral promises.[4] All the vicissitudes of the promises were God's preparation for the fulness of time, Matthew 1:1-17. The genealogy does not answer the bald question: "Is this man Jesus the Messiah?," but, "What sort of a Christ is Jesus?," "Is he the icon of the God of Israel?," "Is he really the expected saviour of all mankind - the sons of Abraham and the subjects of David?"[5]

---

1 Cf. J. Goldingay, "The Chronicler as a Theologian," *BTB* 5 (1975) 99-126, esp. pp. 112-124 (although Goldingay fails to note that the particularism of Ezra-Nehemiah is not shared by 1-2 Chronicles); J. D. Newsome, "Towards a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes," *JBL* 94 (1975) 201-217, esp. pp. 202-212.

2 "For the original audiences such lists of names, reminding them of their ancestry and privileges, may well have constituted a sermon in themselves": R. J. Coggins, *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 12.

3 Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 76; cf. pp. 44-76 on the Chronicler's genealogies, and pp. 179-184 comparing Mt 1:8-16 with the Old Testament.

4 As already noted by St. Jerome: "quia ad hos [Abraham et David] tantum est facta de Christo repromissio," *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum, Series Latina* 57, *Hieronymus* I/7 (Turnholti: Brepols, 1969) 7. Compare J. Radermakers, *Au fil de l'évangile selon saint Matthieu* (Heverlee, 1972) 27; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 190, 199-200.

5 See also Brown, *Messiah*, 65. However, he prefers to stress the structuring of history and the authentication of office holders.

B. SCRIPTURAL ALLUSIONS IN MATTHEW 1:18-25

In this excursus on the genealogy, four elements appear to be coloured by the Old Testament: the annunciation of a child-hero, the revelation by means of a dream, the creative power of the holy spirit, and the schema in verses 24-25 conveying man's total compliance with the command of God.

1) *The Annunciation of the Birth of a Child-Hero*

It is widely held that biblical annunciations constitute a special literary genre.[1] Yet when these scenes are compared, many divergences appear.[2] If the problem remains posed in the form, "Is the annunciation a literary genre or not?," little progress can be made. Instead it should be asked, "What is the significance of these multiple similarities and dissimilarites between these scriptural passages?" The basis of an answer lies in a closer examination of Old Testament scenes of divine authorization, of which three categories may be distinguished.

First, annunciations of births comprise a declaration of the conception and birth, a bestowal of the name on the child, and an intimation of its destiny. Examples of this pattern include Genesis 16:11-12 (Ishmael); Judges 13:3-5 (Samson); Isaiah 7:14-17 (Emmanuel); and 1 Chronicles 22:9-10 (Solomon).[3] Secondly, a commissioning formula may be recognized in the cases of Moses (Exodus 3:2-13; 4:1-17), Gideon (Judges 6:12-24), Jeremiah (Jeremiah 1:4-10), and probably Isaiah (Isaiah 6:1-13).[4] The structure is

---

1 Of this opinion are M. Allard, L. Alonso Schökel, J. P. Audet, M. Cambe, J. Gewiess, S. Muñoz Iglesias, and F. J. Schierse, who are cited in G. Graystone, *Virgin of All Virgins. The Interpretation of Luke 1:34* (Rome: [no publisher], 1968) 68 n. 70, or H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium. Erster Teil. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50* (HTKNT III/1; Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1969) 59 n. 136.

2 Compare Graystone, *Virgin of All Virgins*, 68-77; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 59-60: "Doch findet man in diesen (unterschiedlichen) Beispielen besser nicht ein eigenes literarisches Genus bewiesen" (p. 59).

3 The basic study was P. Humbert, "Der biblische Verkündigungsstil und seine vermutliche Herkunft," *AfO* 10 (1934/36) 77-80. Birth annunciations are not distinguished in the table on p. 335 of S. Muñoz Iglesias, "El Evangelio de la Infancia en San Luca y las infancias de los héroes bíblicos," *EstBib* 16 (1957) 329-382. See also the following note.

4 Twenty-seven examples of this pattern (fourteen of them in Gen and Ex) in the Hebrew Old Testament are proposed by B. J. Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20* (SBLDS 19; Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1974) 32-67.

quite clear: after a statement that the divinity or its angel has appeared, the future instrument of God betrays fear or distress; a message is then given, which is met by an objection from the recipient, which in turn is overcome by a sign from God.[1] A third, and less well defined, form is one which may be termed a revelatory vision. Examples of this are Tobit 12:6-22; Daniel 8:15-27; 9:20-27; 10:4-21. These passages differ negatively from the preceding types by lacking either a prediction of a birth or request for a sign, or even the reception of one. The angel receives more attention. The essential element common to all three forms is the divine legitimation of the subject of the annunciation, the commissioning, or the angelic revelation.

These three schemes by no means exhaust the possibilities. In Genesis 17:1-21 and 18:10-14 Abraham seems to combine the first two types. Neither Matthew 1:20-21 nor Luke 2:9-12 can be confined within any single class. The conclusion is manifest. The concept of a strict genre is not verified. There is a rich but recognizable tradition for expressing the communication of God with men. Matthew here writes from within that tradition, but is not reproducing any single prototype. Although the prediction to Joseph of Jesus' birth, name, and role strikingly resembles that to Abraham about

---

1 Important earlier studies by N. Habel, R. Kilian, K. Baltzer, and W. Richter are mentioned by Hubbard, *Primitive Apostolic Commissioning*, 26; or by K. Gouders, "Zu einer Theologie der Prophetischen Berufung," *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 79-93; "'Siehe, ich lege meine Worte in deinen Mund.' Die Berufung des Propheten Jeremias (Jer 1,4-10)," *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 162-186; "Die Berufung des Propheten Jesaja (Js 6:1-13)," *BibLeb* 13 (1972) 89-106, 172-184. See further, D. J. McCarthy, "An Installation Genre?," *JBL* 90 (1971) 31-41; B. O. Long, "Prophetic Call Traditions and Reports of Visions," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 494-500; W. Vogels, "Les récits de vocation des prophètes," *NRT* 95 (1973) 3-24; G. del Olmo Lete, *La vocación del líder en el antiguo Israel. Morfología de los relatos bíblicos de vocación* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, III, Studia 2; Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 1973). Vogels and del Olmo Lete distinguish four types of call, but their categories do not coincide. Gouders identifies a prophetic mission by word or by vision. Long argues, in effect, for the fusion of Gouders' two classes, when he shows how a dream can be integral to W. Richter's schema of a verbal calling. McCarthy, Hubbard, Gouders, and Long rightly stress the element of legitimation of the subject, his being encouraged and empowered to be the instrument of God. However, despite this variety of opinion and emphasis, the three loose patterns of divine authorization described above respect the complexity of the scriptural data, without imposing an artificial *Gattung*.

Isaac in Genesis 17:19, it would be wrong to deduce that Joseph is cast as the new Abraham.[1] The echoes of other texts are hardly less distinct in Matthew. For instance, the angel of the Lord of the Gospel does not feature in Genesis 17:19, but it is present in the similar Genesis 16:11 and Judges 13:3-5. Also, Joseph is addressed as a son of David, not of Abraham, which recalls two other annunciations of an heir to David - 1 Chronicles 22:9-10 (Solomon) and 1 Kings 13:2 (Josiah).

2) *Revelation by means of a Dream*

Night visions, dreams, and their interpretations are quite frequent in the Old Testament.[2] The Elohist has many accounts of dreams: Genesis 20: 6-7; 28:11-12; 31:11-13, 24; 37:5-10; 40:8-19. They are not unlike Matthew 1:20; 2:12, 13, 19, 22 (and 27:19). Yet there are some marked differences. The New Testament dreams and night visions occur only in Acts and Matthew. Unlike some of their Old Testament counterparts, they are never bad omens,[3] wholly visual,[4] or in need of interpretation. Neither does God "come in a dream by night" (though see Acts 23:11). In the New Testament the recipient is always silent and passive.[5] All attention is concentrated on the

---

1 Against A. H. M'Neile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London, 1915, repr. 1949) 8; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 57-59, 91-94.

2 The topic is well covered by A. Oepke, "ὄναρ," *TDNT* 5 (1967) 220-238, esp. p. 230, "II. 2. The Dream as a Regular Means of Revelation in Yahwism," and pp. 235-236 on Matthew - "Primitive Christianity is not hostile to dreams, but it is strongly critical"; W. Michaelis, "ὁράω," *TDNT* 5, pp. 315-382; H. Balz, "ὕπνος," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 545-556; W. Richter, "Traum und Traumdeutung im Alten Testament," *BZ* 7 (1963) 202-220.

3 The distress of Pilate's wife in Mt 27:19 is attributed to "that just man," not to her dream.

4 See Michaelis, *TDNT* 5, pp. 372-373; Balz, *TDNT* 8, p. 553; S. Cavaletti, "I sogni di San Giuseppe," *BeO* 2 (1960) 149-151; O. da Spinetoli, *Introduzione ai Vangeli dell'Infanzia* (Brescia, 1967) 31.

5 Examples are Mt 1-2; Lk 2:8-15; Acts 5:19-20; 12:6-11; 16:9; 18:9; 23: 11; 27:23-24. Contrast the dream of Jacob in Gen 31:11, and the day visions which have dialogue: Lk 1:11-20; Acts 10:3-6, 9-16; 22:6-10; 22: 17-21. At least in the New Testament, a dream is a personal communication containing a commission (Matthew) or consolation (Acts). Compare J. P. Audet, "L'annonce à Marie," *RB* 63 (1956) 346-374, at pp. 350-351; Cavaletti, "Sogni," 149; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 150-151; T. Stramare, "I sogni di San Giuseppe," *CahJos* 19 (1971) 104-122; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 223-225, who believes Gen 46:2-4 may well have served as the model on which Matthew's dream narrative is patterned.

word and will of God, as it is in the Elohist. Matthew's spare style and theocentric simplicity, demanding a human response of absolute trust and silent submission, distinguish his dream narratives from many of their Old Testament counterparts. Indeed, the greater sobriety and theological density of the New Testament versions bespeak a refinement of, and a relative independence from, their biblical predecessors.

3) *The Creative Power of the Holy Spirit*

A glance at a biblical concordance suffices to establish that the πνεῦμα ἅγιον (without the article in Matthew 1:18 and 20, and Luke 1:35) is a relatively late biblical euphemism for the earlier πνεῦμα θεοῦ.[1] Found but thrice in the Hebrew (Psalm 51:13; Isaiah 63:10-11), it occurs another five times in the Septuagint Daniel and Wisdom. Only in the more recent books is human life ascribed explicitly to the spirit of God (e.g., Ezekiel 37:1-14; Job 27:3; Isaiah 42:5; Wisdom 12:1); or is that spirit seen as active in creation (e.g., Genesis 1:2; Psalm 33:6; Judith 16:14; Wisdom 1:7). There is no close Old Testament analogue to the life-imparting holy spirit of the Gospel of the Origins.[2] Apparently Matthew applies the current theological term πνεῦμα ἅγιον to a divine reality which has an explicit, if limited, place in the sacred books. There the spirit denotes a scale of being sweeping from the "impersonal" wind, through breath, principle of existence, charismatic power, moral insight and capacity, the life of a man, right up to the "personal" angel. The opening chapters of Luke find no incongruity in presenting the holy spirit as at one moment "impersonally" inspiring prophecy in Zechariah, Elizabeth, Simeon, and Anna, and at another coming "personally" upon Mary to produce Jesus. The very fusion of cosmic "impersonal" creation and "personal" redemption in both Testaments witnesses to the absence of a dichotomy between the objective moral power and the personal begetter of the Christ.[3]

---

1 See further C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947 [4th corrected impression 1966]) 18-24; H. Kleinknecht, W. Bieder, F. Baumgärtel, E. Sjöberg, E. Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," *TDNT* 6 (1968) 332-455; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (SNTSMS 5; Cambridge: University Press, 1967) 209-293; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 81-87; Isaacs, *Concept of Spirit*, 12-14, 20-25

2 Cf. Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, 20, 23; Baumgärtel, *TDNT* 6, p. 363.

3 Is it of great moment to decide if πνεῦμα in such a passage of Paul

4) *The Obedience Formula*

The last two verses of the pericope are a splendid example of an Old Testament form of expression for human submission to God. This obedience formula has been capably and convincingly analyzed by Rudolf Pesch.[1] In the Pentateuch, Second Samuel, and Job he detects a set of fixed phrases describing man's obedience to a direct or indirect divine ordinance.[2] The full three stage schema is found in Matthew 1:24-25:

A. *Reaction* to the command or situation is noted: "Joseph woke from sleep";

B. *Obedience* is asserted: "he did as the angel of the Lord commanded him";

C. *Execution* of the command is described: "[1] he took his wife, [2] but knew her not until she had borne a son; and [3] he called his name Jesus."

These verses are moulded by the overpowering Old Covenant reverence for God, a reverence which, as will later appear, the evangelist made his very own.

---

signifies the non-personal complexus of spiritual gifts bestowed by Christ, or what was later to be called the Third Divine Person? Is it correct to call a spiritual endowment impersonal? Surely it is a deeper appropriation of the Holy Spirit, involving deeper personalization. It is sobering to recall that for millenia before Jesus appeared on earth, and even in Israel, the "personal" righteousness of the king was considered to influence the "impersonal" weather and crops (for example, Ps 72)! The occidental, analytic, distinction - even opposition - between "impersonal" creating spirit and "personal" begetting spirit is a dispensable one.

1 "Eine alttestamentliche Ausführungsformel im Matthäusevangelium. Redaktionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Beobachtungen," *BZ* 10 (1966) 220-245, and 11 (1967) 79-95.

2 The obedience formula is particularly frequent in Exodus, e.g., 1:17; 7:6, 10, 20; 40:16. The schema gained popularity, since there are more instances of it in the Greek than in the Hebrew (pp. 226-229). Particularly clear examples are Ex 3:21-22 and Job 42:9LXX. Pesch makes a good case for the formula always referring, directly or indirectly, to the execution of the will of God (pp. 229-230). Apparently without dependence on Pesch, W. Vogels ("Vocation des prophètes," 4-7) has found a very similar pattern in the prophets. He calls it the officer and soldier type, and suggests its roots are in the holy war ideology. The instances he cites (Hos 1:2-3; Jon 3:2-4; 1 Kings 19:15, 19) lack Pesch's second stage, B. Obedience. But this is present in the call of Abraham (Gen 12:1, 4), which Pesch overlooks. The appearance of the formula in Mt 1:24-25 does not make Joseph a second Abraham, but it does show that he had absorbed the good example of the founding fathers and watchmen of Israel. G. M. Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 232-234) develops Pesch's obedience formula into a command and execution pattern covering the whole pericope, without enriching the Old Testament resonance.

C. SCRIPTURAL ALLUSIONS IN MATTHEW 2:1-23

A counterpoint from almost the entire Old Testament makes itself heard here. The Pentateuch contributes Exodus 1-4 and Numbers 23-24. The Davidic saga is continued. The exile and return are echoed. The glory of the New Jerusalem is anticipated in the homage of the magi - Psalm 72 and Isaiah 60. However, in this counterpoint three melodies may be distinguished. Throughout the chapter the usurping king in Jerusalem is pitted against the Davidic shepherd child of Bethlehem. Secondly, the exodus is in the background of 2:13-23, in its Mosaic, prophetic, and Babylonian modes. Less demonstrable are the pervading patriarchal themes. These three elements will be considered in their order of biblical antiquity, which is the reverse of their order of significance in Matthew.

1) *The Trials of the Patriarchs*

The two leading interests of Genesis 12-35 are the concern of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob for their wives and sons, and for their inheritance of the land of Canaan. God opens the womb of Sarah (Genesis 21:1), of Rebekah (25:21), and of Rachel (30:22). Their wives are in jeopardy, and with them the fulfilment of the divine promises: Genesis 12:10-13:1; 20:1-18; 26:1-13; 33:1-2. Like the angel directing Joseph in Matthew, God guides the founding fathers of Israel by means of their dreams. They traverse Palestine, whither God leads them back after sojourns in Egypt or Mesopotamia (Genesis 12:10; 13:1; 26:1-5; 28:15; 31:3, 16; 32:10; also, 42:2-4; 46:3-4). Their resting places in Canaan are aglow with grace and destiny. They are bridgeheads of the kingdom of God. The placenames of the prophetic geography of Matthew 2 may have little overt relation to the patriarchs, but the sacredness of the Promised Land shines out already in Genesis.[1]

---

1 The Genesis promise, and consecration, of the Land is part of the wider background to the placenames thronging Mt 2: Bethlehem, Judah, Jerusalem, Egypt, Ramah, Israel, Galilee, Nazareth. Placenames make the whole of Palestine a book. Jerusalem exists only as the city of David, and Bethlehem only as his humble birthplace. Egypt means slavery, Israel salvation. "Dans le dispositif des figures, l'histoire pivote en géographie, le discours pivote en lieu. L'habitat d'Israël n'est rien sans cette membrane invisible qui est celle de l'*être-encore-là du lieu*, cette coupole ou ce dôme de signification qui entoure le lieu comme sa gloire et sans lequel il serait irrespirable": P. Beauchamp, "La figure dans l'un et l'autre Testament," *RSR* 59 (1971) 209-224, at p. 214.

The Joseph cycle of Genesis 37-50 is echoed in the dreams and sojourn in Egypt of Matthew 2. Although the dream messages of the Gospel are very different to those of the patriarch, it is again a Joseph, son of Jacob and Rachel (Matthew 1:16, and note 2:18-19), who brings the heir of the promise to safety in Egypt.

Although there are very few significant allusions to specific texts in Genesis,[1] the theology of the first book of the Bible is probably not absent from the opening chapters of the first book of the New Testament:[2] the promise of an heir in the Land made to parents and their sons, who are persecuted by rulers, but watched over by the Lord, who guides them by

---

1 Important are the reference to Gen 49:10 in Mt 2:1-2, and to Gen 37:28 in Mt 2:19. Joseph's dreams are similar to Gen 17:19 and 46:2-4; and the patriarchs and Rachel are mentioned by name. However, vocabulary contacts with the Septuagint Genesis, noted by some commentators, have no referential significance, e.g., μάγος (Gen 41:24 Sym.); παραλαμβάνειν (Gen 31:23; 45:18; 47:2); σφόδρα (Gen 27:34; 41:31).

2 To say that the Genesis 12-50 theology is "probably not absent" from Mt (1-)2 allows for the transference of the patriarchal hope to David, a process seen in action in Gen 12:3 (the Gentiles blessed); 26:3-5 (Isaac); 28:13-15 (Jacob); 49:8-10 (Judahite); cf. H. Leroy, "'Sein Name wird sein Emmanuel.' Die Kindheitsgeschichte nach Matthäus," *BK* 19 (1964) 110-117, at p. 111. In post-exilic Judaism the various strains of tradition increasingly merged. Perhaps even before this period the whole of Genesis had been seen through Davidic eyes, if it is true that the Yahwist belonged to court circles. In favour of this see W. Brueggemann, "David and his Theologian," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 156-181; H. Schulte, *Die Entstehung der Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament* (BZAW 128; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972); O. H. Steck, "Genesis 12,1-3 und die Urgechichte des Jahwisten," *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (ed. H. W. Wolff), 525-554. Whether or not it is the insight of the Yahwist, there is a correlation between the covenant with Abraham and that with David. This is explored by R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David. Genesis 15 and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition* (SBT 2/5; London, 1967), esp. pp. 47-60; D. J. McCarthy, *Old Testament Covenant. A Survey of Current Opinions* (Growing Points in Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 1972) 46-49, 54-55, 80-85. In its turn the Davidic covenant promise was applied to the people in general, as is pithily expressed by Jer 4:2, which is the climax of the covenant liturgy according to J. Muilenberg, "Abraham and the Nations. Blessing and World History," *Int* 19 (1965) 387-398, at p. 395. Four traits of the Old Testament portrait of David are picked out by S. Amsler, *David, roi et messie. La tradition Davidique dans l'Ancien Testament* (Cahiers théologiques, 49; Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963) 73-77. He states that the people share in them by reason of the covenant. This gradual democratization of the Genesis and Davidic promises culminates in the prophetic new covenant of Isa 55:3; 59:21; 61:8; Jer 31:31-34. Thus the patriarchal climate of Mt 1:18-2:23 may be mediated through the more explicit Davidic and prophetic allusions. Cf. pp. 170 n. 2, 224 n. 2.

dreams, and rescues them by a descent into Egypt arranged by Joseph.

2) *The Archetype of the Exodus*

The exodus experience influences Matthew 2 in its three modes: Mosaic, prophetic, and exilic. The main contacts with the Moses saga are taken from the second and fourth chapters of Exodus. No strict parallel seems to be intended between the Pharaonic pogrom against the Hebrew males and Herod's much more limited assault against the infants of Bethlehem. This appears in the fact that Matthew shares no vocabulary with the key verses Exodus 1:16 and 22. There is a reminiscence of Exodus 2:15, Φαραὼ . . . ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν Μωυσῆν, in Matthew 2:13 and 16, μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον . . . ἀποστείλας ἀνεῖλεν πάντας τοὺς παῖδας. But this is only an echo of Exodus, or at most a general allusion to achieve an appropriate atmosphere. The sole univocal allusion to Exodus is to 4:19-20 in Matthew 2:19-20, τελευτήσαντος . . . τεθνήκασιν γὰρ οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου.[1] Here again the parallel hardly exceeds that of phraseology. The divergence between the content of each episode is not to be brushed aside too lightly.[2] An indication of how little Matthew 2 is modelled on the exodus story is the use of ἀναχωρεῖν in each. The verb first occurs in the Septuagint in connection with Moses in Exodus 2:15, a verse which has been shown to have two other verbs in common with Matthew 2. Yet the Gospel

---

1 Οἱ ζητοῦντες is less a generalizing plural than a borrowing from Exodus; see R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, 1967) 131 n. 1; also, K. Stendahl, "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Mt. 1-2," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (ed. W. Eltester; Berlin, 1960, 2nd ed. 1964) 99 n. 22; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 87. The delicate question of gauging the dependence of the First Gospel on Exodus is investigated by P. Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium. Ein Judenchristliches Evangelium?* (Aarhus, 1958) 165-166; and P. Gaechter, "Die Magierperikope (Mt 2,1-12)," *ZKT* 90 (1968) 257-295, at pp. 279-281. The former classifies the Gospel's purely verbal reminiscence as *Bibelstil*, while the latter concludes, "Matthäus drückt Heiliges mit heiligem Text aus" (p. 280). The allusion to Exodus is judged uncertain by P. Bonnard, *L'Évangile selon saint Matthieu* (CNT 1; 2nd ed.; Neuchâtel, 1970) 29-30. It is more accurate to say that the allusion is certain, but that the correspondence does not involve the context of either passage; against Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 153f.

2 Whereas Moses, an unaccompanied adult, voluntarily leaves Egypt to hide in Midian, Jesus, an infant accompanied by his parents, leaves for Egypt because Joseph was so instructed by an angel. The return of Moses and that of Joseph are more alike (Ex 4:19-20, but note verse 18). In short, Matthew's terminology is chosen to suit his own narrative.

first uses the verb of the escape of the magi (2:12-13), and afterwards uses it of Joseph (2:14, 22). If Matthew 2 does borrow it from Exodus 2: 15, it certainly makes it its own. In conclusion, it may be said that if any close analogy is to be drawn between the Moses cycle of Exodus 1-4 and Matthew 2:13-23, it is between Pharaoh and Herod and between Joseph and Moses, and not between Jesus and Moses. Here is encountered sacred history expressed in sacred words.

The prophetic strain in the exodus is heard in the echoes of the Balaam cycle of Numbers 22-24 in Matthew 2. André Paul has made a thorough comparison. He notes the occurrence in both Matthew and Numbers of ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, ἀστήρ, and προσκυνεῖν. Further, he draws three comparisons: Balak and Herod, Balaam and the magi, and Israel and Jesus.[1] If Numbers 22-24 is compared with Matthew 1:18-2:23, the shared vocabulary is even more extensive than Paul indicates. Παραλαμβάνειν occurs only nine times in the LXX Pentateuch, but it occurs five times in Numbers 22-23 and in Matthew 1:18-2:23. The angel of the Lord, νυκτὸς, gold, Emmanuel (cf. Numbers 23:21), and the divine bringing out from Egypt are found verbatim in both passages. Most impressive of all, the same two verbs describe the outmanoeuvring and rage of Herod and Balaam (and king Balak!): ἐμπαίζειν and θυμοῦν (Matthew 2:16 and Numbers 22:27, 29; 24:10). Nevertheless, the addition of these eight possible contacts to the evidence gathered by Paul weakens rather than strengthens his case for dependence. *Qui nimis probat, nihil probat!* With the exception of ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, ἀστήρ, ἐθυμώθη, and possibly ἄγγελος, the use of these terms differs in each context. The Gospel obviously draws on the Balaam cycle, but it does not follow it closely. The evaluation of the verbal parallels does not support Paul's theory that Numbers 22-24 provides a *strict* literary model for Matthew 2: 1-12.[2]

---

1 See Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 100-103; cf. Brown, *Messiah*, 193-196.

2 If the "by night" of Mt 2:14 is intended to express more than the promptitude of Joseph's obedience, and the stealth required to evade Herod (compare Mt 27:13), it recalls the thirteen mentions of night in the account of the Passover in Ex 11-14. Granted this decidedly slender possibility, the exodus of Jesus is from Jerusalem, as it will be for all disciples at the end of the Gospel. Now Jerusalem is "Egypt", as the peculiar position of 2:15b could imply. Logically the quotation should be at 2:21. Note the considerations of Hill, *Matthew*, 85; and J. Mánek, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NovT* 2 (1957) 8-23, at pp. 13-14.

There may also be in Matthew 2 a reminiscence of the second exodus from Babylon. This return is the whole context of the quotation in 2:18 of Jeremiah 31:15. The coming of the magi has overtones of the glory of the New Jerusalem.[1] A more equivocal reference to the return from exile is Matthew 2:21. The awkward two stage journey (to "the Land of Israel" in 2:21, and to the district of Galilee and Nazareth in 2:22-23) is best understood as evoking the coming back from Babylon. The phrase, "Land of Israel," is rare in the Bible until Ezekiel, where it denotes resettlement in the fatherland some seventeen times. After this reminiscence of the second exodus comes the migration from royal Judaea to Galilee of the Gentiles (Matthew 4:15) and to Nazareth, in accordance with prophecy.[2]

3) *The Sure Oath to David*

From the strictly scriptural point of view, neither the patriarchal nor the exodus tradition can be said to give Matthew 2 its texture. Of course no single Old Testament model structures the passage.[3] But the Davidic motif is the most prominent. It will be considered under four heads: the confrontation between Davidic Bethlehem and Herodian Jerusalem; the resultant lethal hostility towards the heir to the throne of David; "the child and his mother"; and the royal elements in the magi episode.

---

1 For the details see Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 274-275, 281; and the following section, 3), d. Soares Prabhu has many observations on the "biblicizing language" (p. 274) of what he considers to be the pre-redactional version of Mt 2, e.g., pp. 221-222, 226-227, 278-283. The use of προάγειν, ἵστημι, and προσκυνεῖν of both the pillar of cloud (Ex 13:21, ἡγεῖτο; 33:9-10) and the star in Mt 2:9 and 11 (p. 280) is typical.

2 On the expression "Land of Israel" see Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 31 and n. 1, who recognizes a patriarchal as well as a deliverance from exile reference; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 42-43, who sees the return of Jacob; E. Nellessen, *Das Kind und seine Mutter. Struktur und Verkündigung des 2. Kapitels im Matthäusevangelium* (SBS 39; Stuttgart, 1969) 68, who suggests it may evoke the exodus. The phrase, however, suits a post-settlement context better. If there is any specific text in mind, it could be Ezek 20:36-38, which speaks both of Egypt and of entrance into the Land of Israel. Compare A. Paul (*L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 162-163), who exaggerates the significance of the possible contact with Ezekiel.

3 "Mt 2 lässt sich aber auch keineswegs aus einem direktem Rückgriff auf das AT erklären" (A. Vögtle, "Das Schichsal des Messiaskindes. Zur Auslegung und Theologie von Mt 2," *BibLeb* 6 [1965] 246-279, p. 252). The suggestion that the whole chapter is built around Isa 60 is fanciful - against J. N. M. Wijngaards, "The Episode of the Magi and Christian *Kerygma*," *IndJT* 16 (1967) 30-41, at p. 37.

a. Bethlehem of David versus Herod's Jerusalem

Bethlehem is given pre-eminence as the town of the humble David. It is introduced before Jerusalem in 2:1; and exalted with Judah, and promoted to leadership over Israel, in the prophetic quotation of 2:6. Three of its four appearances follow the second and last mention of the capital in 2:3, namely 2:5, 6, 8. The downfall of Herod's Jerusalem is complete when the magi are divinely instructed to avoid Herod on their return journey, 2:12.[1] Later Bethlehem evokes another scriptural quotation (2:18), and the transfer to Nazareth is legitimated by recourse to prophecy (2:23).

This deepening of the Davidic resonance is also achieved by the ironic use of the title "king," which was firmly associated with David in 1:6. From the outset of Matthew 2 Herod is called king, but immediately a greater than he appears, the recently born "King of the Jews" (2:1-2). Herod is also called king when he shudders with apprehension and summons his advisers, and when the magi are about to leave Jerusalem (2:3, 9). But after they have worshipped the child, Herod is never dubbed king (2:12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 22). The omission of the title suggests that the kingship has returned to lowly Bethlehem at 2:11. The indubitable irony surrounding the act of homage in 2:2, 8, 11 favours the detection of significance in the absence of "king" as the action progresses.

b. The Heir to the Throne of David in Jeopardy

It is a commonplace of world history and legend that rulers seek to annihilate burgeoning rivals to their power.[2] Israel was no exception.

---

1 This induction from a tale of two scripturally coloured cities is a dramatic, not a logical, truth, although expressed in a word pattern. Developing some considerations of E. Lohmeyer (*Matthäus*, 19-20), an act in six scenes, comprising three questions from Herod in Jerusalem and three answers received by the magi in Bethlehem, is elaborated by Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 97-99. Such a structure would support the contrast being made here. Unfortunately, it does not withstand examination. Herod is passive in the first scene, not questioning. There is no question in the third scene, simply a request. Herod's question of 2:7 has its aftermath in 2:16, rather than in 2:12 as required by Paul. His statement that the magi received their answer from the star in 2:9-10 overlooks the explicit reply from the Jerusalem authorities in verse 8.

2 Cf. P. Saintyves, "Le massacre des Innocents, ou la persécution de l'Enfant Prédestiné," *Congrès d'histoire du christianisme (Jubilé Alfred Loisy)* (ed. P.-L. Couchoud; Paris/Amsterdam: Rieder/Van Holkema & Warendorf's, 1927), 1.228-272, esp. pp. 232-258; Erdmann, *Die Vorgeschichten*, 57-60.

Their first "king," Abimelech, came to power by assassinating his seventy brothers (Judges 9:1-6). Saul strove to liquidate David. Jehu put an end to the Omrid dynasty (2 Kings 10:1-11). Joram the Davidid slew his six brothers in order to retain power (2 Chronicles 21:2-4); and his Samarian wife Athaliah tried to massacre all the Davidids, but her intention was thwarted by the Jerusalem princess Jehosheba, who brought one prince to safety (2 Kings 11:1-2). Herod's step by step liquidation of the Hasmoneans is charted by Josephus. This palace background of suspicion, usurpation, and murder makes Herod's hostility to the new-born King of the Jews (Matthew 2:2), the fear of the Christ (2:3-4), and the intrigue against the Davidid from Bethlehem (2:5-8, 16-18, [22]), part of a familiar pattern. It must be admitted, however, that there appear to be no verbal contacts between Matthew 2 and the biblical tales of violence at court, except for 2:13-15, which echoes Solomon's malevolence against Jeroboam, who had to take refuge in Egypt until the monarch's death (1 Kings 11:40). This passage most resembles Matthew in content, but the terminology of Exodus 2:15 is closer to the Gospel. There is a further distant royal parallel in Uriah's flight from King Jehoiakim to Egypt (Jeremiah 26:21). Consequently, it is wiser not to press a conscious allusion to (as distinct from a reminiscence of) either Exodus or First Kings.

A minor but puzzling feature of this court persecution is the precision that the Bethlehem infants slain were males "two years old or under."[1] Ἀπο δυετοῦς (Matthew 2:16) has but two Greek Old Testament parallels: 2 Maccabees 10:3 (μετὰ δυετῆ χρόνον: sacrifice resumed in the temple after a lapse of two years); and the strikingly appropriate 2 Samuel 13:23 (εἰς δυετηρίδα ἡμερῶν). Absalom waited two full years after the humiliation of Tamar by David's firstborn Amnon. Then he had the heir to the throne killed, whom David "loved, for he was his firstborn" (2 Samuel 13:21 LXX; and

---

1 On this puzzling construction see D. Baldi, *L'infanzia del Salvatore. Studio esegetico dei Vangeli di San Matteo e di S. Luca* (Roma: Libreria Francesco Ferrari, n.d. [1925]) 31. He translates the phrase *a bienni (puero)*, and not *a bimatu*, along the lines of 1 Chron 27:23; 2 Chron 31:16; Num 1:3, 30. See also Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 29 n. 2. Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 259) considers the expression derives from a pre-redactional story about Herod's massacre, which was later artificially joined to the magi story. But if this is the case, why is the insertion so clumsy, so "extrinsic and artificial"?

note the other additions in verses 16 and 27, which increase the dramatic tone in the Greek). Whereas Absalom, the future usurper of the throne of David, killed only David's firstborn son (this is emphasized in 2 Samuel 13:30-33), the other usurper of David's throne, Herod, killed all the infant sons of Bethlehem - except the Firstborn of David. Such a background does give new depth to Matthew 2:16-18. But could a Christian audience be expected to associate the "two years" of each Testament, despite the Davidic mood of both contexts? It may seem exaggerated to suggest an affirmative answer, but two factors deserve consideration. This mention of age must have some significance, since Matthew has pared away all unnecessary emotion and all storyteller's detail from the fascinating events of the second chapter.[1] Secondly, the age of the children is explicitly related to the time of the appearance of the king's star in Matthew 2:16b. Nevertheless, it is possible that "two years old or under" indicates unweaned infants.[2]

c. The Child and His Mother

No less than five times does Matthew 2 speak of "the child and his mother" (verses 11, 13, 14, 20, 21). Doubtless the phrase flows naturally

---

1 Accepting the First Gospel as it stands, without attempting to distinguish tradition from redaction, the style impresses as dry, disciplined, and spare. "Le pittoresque le laisse indifférent. Le mouvement est pour lui agitation, et l'émotion sensiblerie. C'est un cérébral. Il aime les idées nettes et les formules lapidaires. Ce chapitre Mt 2 surprend dans son oeuvre" (A.-M. Denis, "L'adoration des Mages vue par S. Matthieu," *NRT* 82 [1960] 32). Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 185-187) posits two sources for Mt 2: the "stylized 'stills'" of the dream narratives, and the "frankly popular narrative" of the Herod story, with its colourful exaggerations, vivid emotions, and love for specification and detail. However, both the stylized 'stills' and the drama of Herod have biblical antecedents which to a considerable degree dictate their tone. Actually the concision and visual economy of Mt 2 liken it to the rest of the work more than Denis or Soares Prabhu would allow. Compare Dibelius, *Formgeschichte*, 126; Vögtle, "Schicksal des Messiaskindes," 262-265; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 23 ("un récit déjà fortement 'limé' en vue de l'enseignement écclésiastique," - on Mt 2:1-12).

2 Samuel was weaned at the age of two (Pseudo-Philo, *Bib. Ant.* 51:1), as was Moses according to *Midrash Rabbah* (eds. H. Freedman and M. Simon; London, 1939), 3.33. 4QMess ar col. 1, line 3, reads, "[.After tw]o years he knows this from that" (J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran Cave 4," *CBQ* 27 [1965] 348-372, pp. 357-361). A three year period before weaning is proposed by G. Pfeifer, "Entwöhnung und Entwöhnungsfest im Alten Testament: der Schlüssel zu Jesaja 28:7-13?", *ZAW* 84 (1972) 341-347.

from the preceding account of conception by the holy spirit, and underscores the absence of human paternity.[1] Yet there is also a regal note. The Davidic Emmanuel of Isaiah 7:14 and Matthew 1:23 becomes the child, τὸ παιδίον, in Isaiah 7:16 and in the splendid messianic oracles 9:6 (παιδίον ἐγεννήθη; compare Matthew 1:16b, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός), and 11:6, 8.[2] In Matthew 2:8-21 the Emmanuel is called τὸ παιδίον nine times, always with the definite article, and in some instances where a form of αὐτός would be more usual (e.g., 2:13b and 20b). Moreover, the Bethlehem infants are not called παιδία, but παῖδας (2:16; and note τέκνα in 2:18). The heavy emphasis on "The Child" in Matthew 2 presents the heir to David who will rule the Gentiles and his people Israel.

The mother of the reigning monarch or "Great Lady" (גבירה) is mentioned by name for all but three of the kings of Judah. It is impossible to get a full picture of her rights and duties, but she was certainly respected and influential, as is illustrated by the careers of Bathsheba, Maacah, and Athaliah. Her power did not proceed merely from the influence of mother over son.[3] The prominence of the queen dowager is not a phenomenon confined to Israel, and it is found today in some African tribes. Perhaps in

---

1 E. Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HNT 4; 2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1927) 16 ("wohl zur Anknüpfung an cap. 1"); F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (The Lutterworth Library; London: Lutterworth Press, 1969) 264; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 95; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 67. Less positive about this connection are J. Michl, "Die Jungfrauengeburt im Neuen Testament," *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute* (MariolSt IV; eds. H. J. Brosch and J. Hasenfuss; Essen: Hans Driewer, 1969) 145-184, p. 154 and n. 43; A. Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn. Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte* (Theologische Perspektiven; Düsseldorf, 1971) 22.

2 See L. S. Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ* (London, 1952) 88-89, 84.

3 Cf. R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel. Its Life and Institutions* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961) 117. See also, H. Donner, "Art und Herkunft des Amtes der Königinmutter im Alten Testament," in *Festschrift J. Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag am 27 August gewidmet* (ed. R. von Kienle; Heidelberg: Winter, 1959) 105-145, esp. pp. 109, 129-130; P. H. A. De Boer, "The Counsellor," *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (VTSup 3; eds. M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas; Leiden: Brill, 1955; repr. 1969) 42-71, esp. pp. 59-61, 64, 69-71; S. Terrien, "The Omphalos Myth and Hebrew Religion," *VT* 20 (1970) 315-338, at pp. 330-331 (who attributes a cultic function to the Gebirah); P. J. Kearney, "Gen 3:15 and Johannine Theology," *MarSt* 27 (1976) 99-109, at pp. 99-100.
Any reference to Mary as the queen mother would be pre-redactional according to Brown, *Messiah*, 192 n. 32. If it is, Mt seems to approve.

a polygamous court she represented dynastic stability.[1] In all probability it is she who features in Isaiah 7:14 and Micah 5:1-4, and perhaps she is retrojected into Genesis 3:15.[2] Beside the second chapter of Matthew, Revelation 12 witnesses to the contemporary appreciation of the queen mother. Thus Matthew's catchphrase "the child and his mother" has a Davidic resonance which is echoed in prophecies recognized as messianic by the early Church.[3]

d. The Magi and Christ the King

The play on the homage due to the King of the Jews and the Christ, as well as the ironic antithesis between royal Jerusalem and Davidic-shepherd Bethlehem, have been touched on in *a.* above. The rising[4] of the star

---

1 According to Song 3:11 Solomon was crowned by his mother on the day of his wedding. Ps 45:16 tells the royal bride, "Instead of your fathers shall be your sons; you will make them princes in all the earth." When the Davidic dynasty seemed faced with extinction in 597 B.C., the queen mother features prominently in Jeremiah's commentary: 13:18; 22:26; 29:2 (and parallels in 2 Kgs 24:12, 15). The significance of the dowager queen "is best explained by the legal custom of documenting the transfer of rule to a new king by having him take official possession of his predecessor's harem (cf. 2 Sam. 16:21ff.); in this fashion the queen mother, as the most important person in the harem, legitimized the right of her son to rule" (G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* [London: SPCK, 1973] 131 n. 20). Compare Ihromi, "Die Königinmutter und der *'amm ha'arez* im Reich Juda," *VT* 24 (1974) 421-429.

2 See O. da Spinetoli, *Maria nella tradizione biblica* (Bibbia e Pastorale, 1; 3rd ed.; Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1967) 38-68; "Esegesi e Mariologia biblica post-conciliare," *EphMar* 20 (1970) 205-225, esp. p. 208 and n. 9; Kearney, "Gen 3:15 and Johannine Theology," 99-102. Cf. J. J. Scullion, "An Approach to the Understanding of Isaiah 7,10-17," *JBL* 87 (1968) 288-300, esp. pp. 290, 300; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 71; J. Schildenberger, "Die jungfräuliche Mutter Maria im Alten Testament," in *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute* (eds. H. J. Brosch, etc.) 109-144.

3 The internecine struggles of Israel's dynasties go very far towards explaining the resonances of Mt 2. Compare A. Farrer, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964) 141-142, who notes the thematic resemblance between 2 Kgs 11, Mt 2, and Rev 12; J. E. Bruns, "The Contrasted Women of Apocalypse 12 and 17," *CBQ* 26 (1964) 459-463, 460 n. 8; Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ*, 121-122, 154-155.

4 The singular ἀνατολή in Mt 2:2 almost certainly means "rising". See M'Neile, *Matthew*, 15; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, 15; K. Ferrari d'Ochieppo, *Der Stern der Weisen. Geschichte oder Legende?* (Wien/München: Herold, 1969) 106-107; Hill, *Matthew*, 82; M. Hengel and H. Merkel, "Die Magier aus dem Osten und die Flucht nach Ägypten (Mt 2) im rahmen der antiken Religionsgeschichte und der Theologie des Matthäus," in *Orientierung an Jesus* (eds. P. Hoffmann, etc.; Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1973) 145.

heralds the appearance of the King of Israel, as Numbers 24:17 had foretold (along with Numbers 24:9 and the allusion to Genesis 49:9-10 concerning the prince of Judah, to whom "shall be the obedience of the peoples"). The star obeys prophecy in several ways. There is no indication that it guided the magi to Jerusalem. Quite the reverse! It is only after the authoritative voice of prophecy in the city of David has unfolded the meaning of the star, that it can reveal where the Messiah of David is to be found (Matthew 2:4-8 and 9-10). Again, the regal star that invites and finally leads the pagan sages sets in motion the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Jerusalem and its Davidic ruler. The homage of foreigners draws on a catena of Old Testament texts, which are just below the surface of the narrative.[1] Prominent among them are Isaiah 2:2-3; 60:3, 6; Psalm 72:10-11.

Isaiah 60 is a hymn to Jerusalem exalted at the end of the days. Obviously a reference to Jerusalem's current glory would be out of place in Matthew 2. But her theological primacy cannot be denied. In accordance with Isaiah 2:2-3 the magi seek enlightenment about the Christ in the city of David: "Many peoples shall come and say, 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord . . . that he may teach us his ways . . . For out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'" The Isaian context has several parallels to the magi pericope. After an appeal to walk in the light of the Lord (τῷ φωτὶ κυρίου), Isaiah 2:5-8 runs in part: ἀνῆκεν γὰρ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ . . . ὅτι ἐνεπλήσθη ὡς τὸ ἀπ'ἀρχῆς ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν κληδονισμῶν . . . ἐνεπλήσθη γὰρ ἡ χώρα αὐτῶν . . . χρυσίου καὶ . . . θησαυρῶν . . . προσεκύνησαν. Five of these words are found in the magi story, namely, *laos*, *chōra*, *chrusion*, *thēsauroi*, *proskunein*. In addition there is the *ap' archēs*, which translates the Hebrew *miqqedem* that is normally rendered, "from the east" (so RSV, BKAT). Therefore, the Hebrew may equally well be understood as meaning ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, which is found in

---

1 See the commentators, and Gundry, *Use of OT in Matthew*, 129; Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 154-155. Gomá Civit (*Mateo*, 67) explains: "El autor ha considerado la escena suficiente en sí misma, y, más que como 'complemento' de otras profecías, profecía en acción y símbolo ella misma de las multitudes que vendrán de oriente y occidente al Reino del Mesías (8,11)." In contrast to the rabbis, Old Testament apocalyptic never expressly quotes scripture; cf. W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (BWANT 88; Stuttgart, etc., 1969) 138. This is also the case for Lk 1-2 and Revelation. Thus there is a tradition of veiled allusion to, and unacknowledged borrowing from, the sacred writings.

Matthew 2:1.[1] Consequently, the "diviners from the east" (RSV correction; LXX, ἐνεπλήσθη ὡς τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς . . . κληδονισμῶν: "filled as at the beginning with divinations") of Isaiah 2:6 may be likened to the μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν of the Gospel. Moreover the gold and treasures of Isaiah 2:7 are associated with idolatry and sun worship,[2] like verses 6 and 8. Seen against this background, the hitherto idolatrous magi of Isaiah 2:6-8, who flock to the light of the Lord of unbelieving Jacob in Jerusalem (2:2-5), reappear in Matthew 2 to convict Israel's leaders of infidelity.[3]

The magian gifts are redolent of ancient near eastern cultic practice.[4] But, more significantly, they are gifts fit for a king - presented by the Queen of Sheba to Solomon (1 Kings 10:2, 10),[5] featuring in royal wedding

---

1 The same ambiguity is acknowledged in the Targum to Isaiah by J. F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949).

2 According to G. Pettinato, "Is. 2,7 e il culto del sole in Giuda nel sec. VIII av. Cristo," *OrAnt* 4 (1965) 1-30, esp. pp. 20-30. The reference to sun worship would be intelligible in the first century, as the Christos Helios mosaic in the necropolis under St. Peter's in Rome indicates (see its illustration in *DBSup* 7 [1966], cols. 1392-1393, figure 749). The earliest patristic commentaries on the magi scene stress that Christ vanquished magic (Ignatius of Antioch), the devil (Justin), and idolatry (Tertullian). See the references in Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 15-16; J. M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (SBT 2/28; London: SCM, 1974) 126-127.

3 Whether or not Isa 2:6-8 is accepted as significant for Mt 2, Isa 2:2-5 is implicit in the Gospel scene; cf. Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 118-119 (and note his indication of a double vocabulary contact with Dan 2:1-2 on p. 116). Either of these Isaian passages is closer to Mt 2 than Isa 41:2-3; against B. Malina, "Matthew 2 and Is 41,2-3," *SBFLA* 17 (1967) 290-302; W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1964), Appendix IV, "Isaiah XLI.2 and the Pre-existent Messiah," pp. 445-446.

4 J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity," *NovT* 17 (1975) 103-105; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 274f.

5 A reference to this incident is excluded by the fact that none of Matthew's key words is found in 1 Kgs 10:1-13 LXX or the slightly divergent 1 Chron 9:1-12; against J. E. Bruns, "The Magi Episode in Matthew 2," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 51-54, whose use of the post-500 A.D. Targum sheni Esther is unconvincing (consult E. Ullendorff, "The Queen of Sheba," *BJRL* 45 [1962/63] 486-504, at pp. 493, 495-496); E. Galbiati, "L'adorazione dei Magi (Matt. 2,1-12)," *BeO* 4 (1962) 20-29; da Spinetoli, *Introduzione*, 34; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 40. The Queen from the south cannot be used to connect Mt 2 and 8:11-12, since ἀπὸ νότου is absent there, although found in the parallel Lk 13:29, as well as in Mt 12:42 and Lk 11:31; against Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 121-122.

songs (Song of Solomon 3:6; 5:13; Psalm 45:8-9), and proudly displayed by Hezekiah as part of the Davidic patrimony (Isaiah 39:2, 6).[1] They are the tribute of the nations to the Son of David.

D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The preceding pages have arrived at a rather sober appreciation about the allusions to the Old Testament in the Matthean Gospel of the Origins. Of course this estimate must be complemented by the exegetical contribution of the Gospel milieu (Chapter 3), and the overriding personal interests of the evangelist (Chapters 6 and 7). At this stage only an interim evaluation can be offered.

These two chapters of Matthew are certainly no mere distillation of Old Testament texts. There is obviously a fresh and definitive intervention of God in Matthew 1. Yet the βίβλος γενέσεως and πνεῦμα do not articulate a new creation patterned on Genesis 1-3. The genealogy presents Jesus as the royal inheritor of the divine promises, and as the focus of history. The twin narrative of 1:18-25 depicts Joseph almost as another patriarch, receiving in a dream the assurance of a son and the continuance of blessing. The annunciation legitimizes the child as the spirit-generated Son of David and Jesus-Emmanuel. The activity of the holy spirit is recognizable from the divine creative power seen at work in scripture. The faithful com-

---

1 The closest LXX parallels to Mt 2:11 are Ps 72:10-11 and Isa 60:6, which have a royal ethos. However, submission to a king involved honouring his god. On the regal character of the gifts see Schweizer, *Mätthaus*, 18; K. Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen im Neuen Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 24 n. 91. No more than two of the magi's three gifts are ever found together in the OT. The difference in Greek terms between such passages as 2 Kgs 10:2, 10 and 2 Chron 9:1, 9, and 2 Kgs 20:13 and Isa 39:2 (cf. 2 Chron 32:27), reveals a fluctuation that dissuades the connection of Mt 2:11 with any single text. For this reason the learned suggestion of G. Ryckmans ("De l'or(?), de l'encens et de la myrrhe, " *RB* 58 [1951] 372-376; compare A. Charbel, "Mt 2,1-7: I Magi erano Nabatei?," *RivB* 20 [1972] 577-578) that, since *zahab* means perfume in some Semitic incense altar inscriptions, it also means this in Mt 2, is ingenious but superfluous. That the gifts are taken from lectionary readings for the end of Sivan (Ex 25; Mal 3; Hag 3) is not borne out by the Septuagint, which has not got λίβανος or σμύρνα in these passages (against C. H. Cave, "St. Matthew's Infancy Narrative," *NTS* 9 [1962/63] 387). Finally, it would not go unnoticed that the three gifts suited magi(cians) in the first century; cf. Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 13, 15-16; Hull, *Hellenistic Magic*, 126-127; H. B. Green, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (The New Clarendon Bible; Oxford, 1975) 59.

pliance of Joseph follows the standard religious pattern of the obedience formula. From Matthew 1:18 onward may be detected a certain patriarchal climate of interest in wife and heir, dreams, the angel of the Lord, threat to life, and migration within and outside the Promised Land. The salvation of the first Joseph, the dreamer who saved Israel through his sojourn in Egypt, springs to mind. There is lacking, however, a series of textual contacts to support systematic allusion to Genesis. In 2:13-21 there are reminiscences of the trials of the adult Moses in Exodus 2 and 4, yet no explicit recall of Pharaoh's pogrom in Exodus 1. The exilic reinterpretation of the exodus is even more muted. However, in the body of the chapter the prophetic (and, as will be seen in Chapter 3, the royal) aura of the exodus shines through the numerous allusions to the Balaam cycle of Numbers 22-24. Lastly, Matthew's second chapter, like his first, is stamped by royal messianism. Bethlehem again sees the genesis of lowly David. The unblessed monarch in Jerusalem, and the Judaean establishment, try to eliminate the heir to the throne of David. The Isaian Emmanuel Child and his queen mother are rescued through the fidelity of a son of David. Finally, primacy passes from royal Jerusalem to persecuted Bethlehem and Galilee of the Gentiles (note 4:15), after the pagans have submitted to the Son of David.[1]

Not to be overlooked is what may be termed the moral continuation of the old economy. The unswerving fidelity of the Lord God to his promises and prophetic word is incarnated not only in the Son of David, but in a righteous son of David, who allows the divine purpose to be realized in its own time and manner: in Bethlehem homage, Egyptian exile, Nazareth refuge.

---

1 It would be an exaggeration to claim that Mt 1-2 programmatically shows Jesus as recapitulating the Genesis promise, exodus, covenant with David, exile, and return to the land of Israel, as does Denis, "L'adoration des Mages," 37; with whom may be compared H. Milton, "The Structure of the Prologue to St. Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 81 (1962) 175-181, 179; Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, LV, and p. 18 qualification; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 22; Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn*, 61-62, 72.
The harmonics of the former covenants are modulated into a new melody, a new song that is itself prophetic. Compare Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 46-48.

CHAPTER 3

THE FIRST CENTURY JEWISH RESONANCE OF MATTHEW 1-2

The preceding chapter explored the formative influence of orthodox written tradition on the Gospel of the Origins. The common Jewish heritage of the Book was no inert possession, but a treasure to be reassessed and appropriated by every rising generation. The pre-baptism cycle must be considered, therefore, in the light of first century religious thought and expression. Two methods are at hand to assay the contribution of the early community. Parallels may be sought between the opening chapters of Matthew and the contemporary or near-contemporary Jewish religious writings. Such is the task of the present chapter. Secondly, the identification of the evangelist's milieu and aims, and of his editorial techniques and theological interests, helps us to share his overall vision. Chapters four, five, six, and seven are devoted to this investigation.

A. THE FIRST CENTURY JEWISH *HERMENEUTIK*

1) *The Relevant Literature*

Before investigating the first century Jewish traits of Matthew 1-2 it is advisable to examine the term "midrash" so often applied to this passage. But first of all the general setting and literature of the midrashim must be determined.

Just as the Church has always coupled scripture to tradition, post-biblical Judaism supplemented the Holy Word with commentary and illustration. The scope and themes of these explanations during the first Christian century are far from clear, due to the restricted number of extant sources. If the synagogue readings then linked passages from the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings (as they certainly did in the second century), a number of motifs would have become commonplace. The later works of the Old Testament (such as Tobit, Judith, Esther, Daniel, and the Wisdom of Solomon), and the early apocrypha or pseudepigrapha, give an idea of the subjects which were likely to have been popular. Examples that suggest

themselves are: the divine ordering of history, fidelity to the Torah and Israelite traditions, the abiding validity of the prophets' oracles, the courage to accept persecution and martyrdom, the rewards of righteousness, the deliverance of Israel and its Land from foreign oppression and pollution, the power of prayer, the importance of brotherly love, the sanctity of marriage, and the childhood grace of biblical heroes.[1]

The main sources of information regarding the first century Jewish understanding of scripture are easy to enumerate. Probably the most important are the writings of Flavius Josephus and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*.[2] Philo of Alexandria was not necessarily representative of all

---

1 A valuable study is that by C. Perrot, "Les récits d'enfance dans la Haggada antérieure au II^{e} siècle de notre ère," *RSR* 55 (1967) 481-518. He shows how mainly pre-evangelical traditions on the childhoods of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Samson, Elijah, and, especially, Moses, trace a theology of the providence of God in history, and foreshadow the child's adult career (p. 506). Against this haggadic background he studies Mt 1-2 and Lk 1-2: their historical setting, literary style, contact with Jewish haggadah, and transmission (pp. 509-518). These haggadoth have their forerunners in canonical literature. See B. S. Childs, "The Birth of Moses," *JBL* 84 (1965) 109-122; also his *Exodus. A Commentary* (OT Library; London: SCM, 1974) 8-14, 20-22, 24-26. In the *Vitae Prophetarum* their adult achievements and charisma are traced to their early years in order to give the full credit to Yahweh. Cf. A. Rofé, "The Classification of the Prophetical Stories," *JBL* 89 (1970) 427-440, esp. p. 435; J. T. Willis, "Cultic elements in the story of Samuel's birth and dedication," *ST* 26 (1972) 33-61, esp. pp. 40 and 61.

2 Josephus' debt to the haggadah has been illustrated by S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Frankfurt a. Main: Kauffmann, 1930). His narrative and dramatic embellishment of the scriptural data concerning the patriarchs, Moses, and Samuel, would also have made the Jewish literature more palatable in hellenistic circles; cf. G. Cohen, "Josephus and Scripture: Is Josephus' Treatment of the Scriptural Narrative Similar Throughout the Antiquities I-XI?," *JQR* 53/54 (1962/63) 311-332. Pseudo-Philo's retelling of the History of Israel from Adam to the death of Saul very probably dates from before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.; see D. J. Harrington, J. Cazeaux, Ch. Perrot, P. M. Bogaert, *Pseudo-Philon. Les Antiquités Bibliques* (SC 229, 230; Paris: Le Cerf, 1976), 2.74. These, and other pre-rabbinic works to be mentioned later, are briefly and conveniently discussed by R. Bloch, "Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique," *RSR* 43 (1955) 194-227, 204-210; G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies* (SPB 4; 2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1973) 3-6, who frequently applies the tag "the rewritten Bible" to such works; R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique* (Tome I; Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1966) 151-165; J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge: University Press, 1969) 29-34.

Diaspora Jewry. His writings are of limited use for the elucidation of the Synoptics. Qumran provides considerable insight into contemporary messianic and eschatological expectation, the tendency towards sectarianism, and methods of exegesis. But, apart from the *Genesis Apocryphon*, its contribution to our acquaintance with the homiletic embellishment of scripture is relatively meagre. The apocrypha furnish some examples of biblical exposition. *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Ethiopian *Enoch*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, the third *Sibylline Oracle*, 2 (4) *Esdras*, and the *Odes of Solomon*, deserve mention as illustrative of the thought world of the Gospels.[1] The Aramaic interpretative paraphrases of the scriptures, the targums, are also a possible witness to first century religious thought.

Before these works may be used for the interpretation of the New Testament, it is of prime importance to establish the date of their composition. Qumran, Philo, and Josephus are certainly prior to, or contemporary with, the first Christian decades. With the exception of 4 *Esdras* and the *Odes of Solomon*, the afore-mentioned apocrypha are almost entirely pre-Christian.[2] The difficulty of dating arises principally concerning the targums and the traditions contained in the midrashim.

Only recently have the targums been re-admitted as valid evidence for the religious outlook of Judaism in New Testament times. This current more favourable attitude is based on two complementary methods employed to establish a date for their composition. Firstly, the targumic traditions are compared with parallels in other material whose chronology is known, viz., Qumran, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus. In this manner a *terminus ad quem* is

---

1 Besides the works listed in the preceding note, and the standard introductions of E. Schürer, R. H. Charles (ed.), and O. Eissfeldt, see A. M. Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; eds. A. M. Denis and M. de Jonge; Leiden: Brill, 1970); A. Paul, R. Le Déaut, J. Carmignac, P. Grelot, and C. Perrot, *Au seuil de l'ère chrétienne* (Introduction à la Bible, III/1; nouvelle édition; eds. A. George and P. Grelot; Paris: Desclée, 1976) 116-129, 182, 185-188 (Grelot).

2 The thorny problem of the presence and extent of Christian interpolations and editing in *Enoch* and the *T. 12 Patr.* is briefly discussed by Le Déaut (*Introduction*, 158-159), who gives further bibliographical references; also, R. N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (SBT 2/17; London: SCM, 1970) 12-14, 83-85; J. Becker, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, III/1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974) 24, and *passim*.

fixed.[1] The second method is more subjective and conjectural. The development of a tradition is traced through several midrashim. A fine example of this procedure is Renée Bloch's comparison of the dream of Pharaoh, and his consultation with advisers, in five different rabbinic tales about the early years of Moses.[2] Presuming that the less developed accounts are earlier, Bloch proceeds to gauge their relative chronological order and probable interdependence. Since a similar account is found in Josephus, the substance of these midrashim goes back to at least the second half of the first century.

Much work remains to be done in order to ascertain the date of the targums. Nevertheless, much of the Palestinian Targum (that is, the substance of *Targum Yerušalmi I* and *Targum Neofiti I*) may be held to reflect Jewish exegesis of the first century.[3] The early midrashim also correspond to this milieu.[4] In sum, Qumran, Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, a few ancient apocrypha,

---

1 This "external" method is outlined by Bloch, "Note méthodologique," 203-210. See also R. Le Déaut, *La nuit pascale. Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42* (AnBib 22; Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1965) 41-57; *Introduction*, 151-181; Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 8-10; M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (AnBib 27; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966) 64-66, 112-117; and n. 3 below.

2 "Note méthodologique," 210 (method), 212-224 (application).

3 Cf. Le Déaut, *Introduction*, 92-98, 118-120; "La tradition juive ancienne et l'exégèse chrétienne primitive," *RHPR* 51 (1971) 31-50; Bowker, *Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 16-20, 26; Miller, "Targum, Midrash," 30-31; E. Schürer (and G. Vermes), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)* (New ed. by G. Vermes and F. Millar Edinburgh: Clark, 1973), 1.101-105; A. Díez Macho, "Le Targum Palestinien," *RevScRel* 47 (1973) 169-231, 189-199; and in his introductions to *Neophyti 1: Targum palestinense, Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Tomo II: Éxodo; Tomo III: Levítico; Tomo IV: Números; Tomo V*, in preparation (Textos y Estudios 8-1 ; Madrid/Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1970-74). But note the caution of Ben Zion Wacholder, *JBL* 93 (1974) 132-133; and of D. W. Gooding, "On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums," *JTS* 25 (1974) 1-11, 11.

4 Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition*, 228) believes that the haggadic adaptation of the Bible was in the main completed "in the peaceful age of the Ptolemaic rule, as may be seen from the fact that in exegetical writings of the second century BC the main haggadic themes are already fully developed." He further states: "The exegesis of the primitive Haggadah must coincide with that of the last redactors of the written Torah" (p. 127; cf. pp. 176-177).

and what are considered the earliest strata of the Palestinian Targum and the oldest midrashim, may possibly shed light on Matthew's Gospel of the Origins. On the other hand, little help is to be expected from Philo. The later Talmuds, the Mishnah, and the rabbinic writings can supply only confirmation of hypotheses advanced on other grounds.

2) *The Function of Midrash*

It remains to clarify a term which is applied to much of the foregoing literature: midrash.[1] In itself the word means "investigation [of scripture]", and therefore it is aptly rendered by "exegesis". Since the type of midrash relevant here is not the regulative (halakah), but the illustrative (haggadah),[2] midrash could equally well be translated "exposition". Essentially midrash is an approach to God's Word which seeks to apply it to the present time.[3] Many misunderstandings will be avoided if two points are grasped at the outset: a. Midrash is not in itself a literary genre; b. Its essence is not precisely its polarization by scripture.

---

1 Three useful studies are: R. Bloch, "Midrash," *DBSup* 5 (1957), cols. 1263-1281; A. G. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 105-138, 417-457 (later published in book form - Staten Island: Alba House, 1967); R. Le Déaut, "A propos d'une définition du midrash," *Bib* 50 (1969) 395-413 (English version in *Int* 25 [1971] 259-282; cf. his "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: le 'targumisme'," *Bib* 52 [1971], esp. pp. 505-509, 525). Besides the provisional synthesis of his *Scripture and Tradition*, Vermes has the briefer, "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* I (eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans; Cambridge: University Press, 1970) 199-231. See also M. D. Herr, "Midrash," *EncJud* 11 (1971), cols. 1507-1514, esp. 1507-1509; Miller, "Targum, Midrash," 43-48; A. Goldberg, "Haggada," *Bibel-Lexikon* (ed. H. Haag; 2nd ed.; Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1968), cols. 655-656: "Grundsätzlich ist die H. theologische Bibelerklärung . . . Die H. bedient sich aller bekannten literarischen Mittel der Zeit (Sage, Gleichnisse, Wortanklang, Diatribe, u. a.)."

2 The distinction between haggadah and halakah is a convenient Cartesian one, but haggadah originally included halakah! See Bowker, *Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 48; M. Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1971/72) 1-14, at p. 1 n. 3; S. Safrai, *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Assen, 1974) I/1, 6-7.

3 Cf. Bloch, "Midrash," cols. 1265-1266; Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 229: "It should be emphasized that the vitality and movement in the history of Haggadah was inspired by what was, in fact, the ultimate purpose of all Jewish exegesis; namely, to fuse Scripture with life"; Goldberg, "Haggada," 656: "Die H. ist wesentlich kerygmatische Exegese und steht so im Gegensatz zur ahistorischen Allegorese."

a. Midrash is not in itself a Literary Genre

The fundamental error of Addison G. Wright is, that he treats midrash as if it were a specific type of writing. To be fair, he is not unaware of the limitations of his treatment. He acknowledges the extreme difficulty of defining a literary genre. He admits that this restricted category is foreign to the original authors, for whom midrash is a type of exegesis.[1] It has been suggested that Wright's title, "The Literary Genre Midrash," should be changed to the narrower, "Midrash *as* a Literary Genre."[2] But an even more appropriate title would be, "Rabbinic Midrash as a Literary Genre," since it is the (mainly post-New Testament) rabbinic midrash which furnish the author's criteria.[3]

Midrash is much more than a form of expression. It is also a manner of thinking, indeed, a way of experiencing, conceptualizing, and communicating Jewish reality. As such it can be described, not defined. The notion of literary genre is a comparatively recent product of the analytic mentality. Ancient Judaism was conscious of writing in a tradition rather than in determined literary forms. This appears from the frequent changes of style in the Old Testament, especially in the prophets - biography, maxim, dirge, oracle, diatribe, parable. Ethiopian *Enoch*, which in its original form dates to early Maccabean times, includes edifying narrative, apocalyptic, and parenesis.[4]

---

1 Wright, "Genre Midrash," 110-113, 120-121; also pp. 138, 439 n. 168.

2 Le Déaut, "A propos," 398 n. 1. Compare E. E. Ellis, "Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (eds. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox; Edinburgh: Clark, 1969) 61-69, p. 64 n. 21: "A. G. Wright's (*op. cit.*) restricted definition of the genre seems to reflect more a practical than a historical distinction"; and his criticism of the narrow understanding of midrash in Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, in *Bib* 53 (1972) 145.

3 Wright, "Genre Midrash," 121-122. On pp. 417-438 he tries to verify the genre of rabbinic midrash in pre-rabbinic works. But reduction to rabbinic conventions does violence to these; cf. Le Déaut, "A propos," 398f.

4 The substance of the foregoing paragraph, and further references, are found in Le Déaut, "A propos," 400-403. See also the treatment of midrash by J. M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970) 94-98.

This vital distinction between midrash as an attitude, a characteristic religious outlook, and midrash as confined to a certain type of literary expression, may be further clarified by a comparison with a much more recent genre. The nineteenth century brought industrialization and urbanization to Europe. The demographic revolution in densely populated areas led to collective, municipal solutions in matters of hygiene, housing, public health, and education. Corporate bodies began to replace private initiative. The age of the proletariat was inaugurated. The advent of a mass industrialized society forced the more perceptive to question their novel situation. In France many individuals began to struggle against the new anonymity. In diaries they held a dialogue with their souls: Maine de Biran, Joseph Joubert, Benjamin Constant, Henri Beyle (Stendahl), Maurice de Guérin, Alfred de Vigny, Eugène Delacroix. The century of urbanization was also, by reaction, the century of the *journal intime*.[1]

Yet no one would hold that this single literary genre captured the whole of the experience, and the world view, of the French during the last century. Here and elsewhere in Europe the poetry of the romantic revival was also part of the questioning of the machine ("And was Jerusalem builded here / Among these dark Satanic mills?," William Blake), and of the unnaturalness of congested city life ("La ville tentaculaire," Emile Verhaeren). The novel, too, bore the mark of its era, whether in Balzac's human comedy or in Dicken's social conscience. The detribalization effected by the city helped to oust the traditional moral influence of the Church, and the social pressure of small, semi-feudal communities. Madame Bovary could turn her back on her convent education and staid market town. Outside the explicit sphere of literature was the ideological ferment of Darwinism and Marxism, each diminishing the significance of the individual. These are but a few instances of how the same basic understanding of life, which gave rise to the keeping of personal diaries, also marked other forms of literature, as well as having influence on the entire social matrix - politics,

---

1 Alain Girard has examined the social significance of diaries as "l'interrogation de l'individu en face de sa position nouvelle dans le monde," in *Le journal intime et la notion de personne* (Paris: P.U.F., 1963) - quotation from p. xi. The diary is thus "un des traits qui caractérisent une époque en transition" (p. xii). More sensitive individuals suffer from their anonymity in a mass society: "sa sensibilité s'aiguise jusqu'à faire de lui un écorché" (p. xiii; cf. pp. 601-605).

economics, and scientific research. Similarly, midrash is a *Hermeneutik* of Jewish existence, which may be expressed in various literary forms, without being exhausted by them. An attitude to life cannot be identified with the literature it inspires.[1] Yet neither can it be isolated from it.

b. The Essence of Midrash is not Polarization by Scripture

This principle is more debatable than the first. A. G. Wright repeatedly stresses that the text of scripture provides the point of departure and the *raison d'être* of every midrash. Yet he himself admits there are exceptions to this rule, and Roger Le Déaut adduces many such examples.[2] Wright's pleading for the absolute priority of the Word of God, and the subordination of the event or situation to which the Word is applied, encounters four difficulties. These can be illustrated from his study.[3] Firstly, creative exegesis, and therefore adaptation to the present, has become a constitutive element of the "genre." Again, the possibility exists of pagan Egyptian works being classified as midrash, if even a tenuous connection with the Old Testament can be shown. Thirdly, the connection between the midrash or "application" and the text that inspired it can be implicit, even "desperate." Lastly, Wright accepts (following Bloch) both reference to scripture *and its actualization* as two primary characteristics of rabbinic midrash.

The four factors listed above, and the palpable fact that sometimes midrash does not exist for the sake of the scriptural text, combine to dethrone reference to the Old Testament as the essence of midrash. Midrash is more accurately thought of as an attitude to scripture and to life which, as R. Bloch and R. Le Déaut (and A. G. Wright!) agree, is based on the biblical text *and its application*, and which assumes a variety of

---

1 Among those who agree that midrash should be associated with the structuring, appropriation, and sharing of religious belief, rather than with a style of writing, are Miller, "Targum, Midrash," 43-44; S. Muñoz Iglesias, "Midráš y Evangelios de la Infancia," *EstE* 47 (1972) 331-359, - "Midraš no es tanto un género literario concreto cuanto un procedimiento hermenéutico que responde a un determinado talante" (p. 357).

2 Le Déaut, "A propos," 406-407. The biblical passage is often only a stimulus to an independent composition. Rabbis sometimes cite texts in order to justify later opinions and usages. Even Wright ("Genre Midrash," 132) acknowledges that "occasionally" midrashim are efforts of rabbis to find a biblical basis for what they have been teaching.

3 The rest of this paragraph is condensed from "Genre Midrash," 134-138.

literary expressions. Neither of these two aspects of midrash - experience and composition - may be suppressed.[1]

The complexity of midrash is to be respected and absorbed, rather than simplified. Two twentieth century scholars from very different traditions shed light on its bipolarity. Judah Goldin writes:

> That conviction lies at the heart of midrash all the time: The Scriptures are not only a record of the past but a prophecy, a foreshadowing and a foretelling, of what will come to pass. And if this is the case, text and personal experience are not two autonomous domains. On the contrary, they are reciprocally enlightening: even as the immediate event helps make the age-old text intelligible, so in turn the text reveals the fundamental significance of the recent event or experience.[2]

With this synthetic approach may be compared Hans-Georg Gadamer's notion of the interpreter calling a received text into meaning:

> Texts are "permanently fixed expressions of life" which have to be understood, and that means that one partner in the hermeneutical conversation, the text, is expressed only through the other partner, the interpreter. Only through him are the written marks changed back into meaning. Nevertheless, by being changed back into intelligible terms, the object of which the text speaks itself finds expression. It is like a real conversation, in that it is the common object that unites the two partners, the text and the interpreter . . .
>
> Thus it is quite correct to speak of a hermeneutical conversation. But from this it follows that hermeneutical conversation, like real conversation, finds a common language, and that this finding of a common language is not, any more than in real conversation, the preparation of a tool for the purpose of understanding but, rather, coincides with the very act of understanding and reaching agreement. Even between the partners of this "conversation" a communication takes place, as between two people, that is more than mere adaptation. The text brings an object into language, but that it achieves this is ultimately the work of the interpreter. Both have a share in it.[3]

---

1 Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 15 n. 109) rightly states that midrash is both an exegetical method with "as it were instinctive beginnings," and a range of literary forms, including rabbinic midrashim. But he afterwards unduly restricts it to the rabbinic genre. The understanding advocated here is more open to appreciation of what it feels like to be a first century Jew(ish Christian), and to sociological factors. See further, J. C. Tulloch, "Sociology of knowledge and the sociology of literature," *The British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976) 197-210; J. Z. Smith, "The Social Description of Early Christianity," *RelSRev* 1 (1975) 19-25 (with his reference to J. G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community*, 1975).

2 In S. Spiegel, *The Last Trial* (New York, 1967) xvi.

3 *Truth and Method* (Translated by G. Barden and J. Cumming from 2nd German ed., 1965; London: Sheed and Ward, 1975) 349-350, and see context.

In the last analysis midrashim are a hermeneutic of the believer's experience of God in his time, an experience conditioned by his community's traditions. By giving a meaning to a scriptural text or reality in their own experience, believers find a meaning for themselves.

This defense of two essential elements in midrash - connection with the Old Testament and contemporization - serves no purely academic end. For instance, some writers on Matthew's quotations emphasize that the life of Jesus is primary, and the fulfilment of prophecy secondary.[1] Certainly this seems to be the evangelist's intention. It is a further step to assert that the subordination of the Old Testament to Christian tradition precludes the classification of Matthew 1-2 as midrash.[2] Such a negative conclusion is logical for those who accept Wright's narrow definition of midrash as a writing which is polarized by the scriptures. Midrash, in this view, is backward-looking; and the Gospels are centred on the Christ. Even specialists in Jewish and rabbinic literature have accepted this reasoning.[3]

Nevertheless, Wright's cutting of the Gordian knot of midrash in the opening two chapters of Matthew (and of Luke) does not escape the charge of oversimplifying a very complex reality. The inadequacy of his assumptions and methods has been shown. Therefore it is impossible to concur with the widespread tendency to exclude the Gospel of the Origins from the category of midrash, on the grounds that these chapters focus on Christ, and not on the Old Testament, which is interpreted in light of him. Midrash oscil-

---

1 E.g., Davies, *Setting*, 208-209: "As in all spheres, it was its Christological orientation that governed or rather stimulated the exegesis of the Christian community" (p.209); A. Vögtle, *BZ* 8 (1964) 254; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 103, 115-117, 144; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 46 and references in n. 68; Miller, "Targum, Midrash," 67.

2 A position adopted by Wright, "Genre Midrash," 454-456; Gaechter, "Magierperikope," 280-281; J. Coppens, *Le messianisme royal. Ses origines. Son développement. Son accomplissement* (LD 54; Paris: Le Cerf, 1968) 152 n. 140; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 99, 136-137; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 15-16 n. 109.

3 Perrot ("Récits d'enfance," 515) accepts Wright's description of midrash as a "literature about a literature," and contrasts the Gospels, where "Si l'on continue à user de l'Écriture, on ne 'sert' plus l'Écriture, on 'se sert de' l'Écriture ... Le midrash est en quelque sorte 'retourné' sur lui-même par des gens qui, délibérément, substituèrent Jésus à la Torah." Consequently, he refuses to call Mt 1-2 midrash.

lates between the two poles of the past and present speaking of God. A midrashic process can be detected in the fact that the life and work of the Christ soon became Sacred Scripture. Whereas Wright, in practice, confines midrash to a movement from scripture to the present situation, the Gospels in the main reflect the opposite process, the development of the messianic present into scripture. The supremacy of Christ, and the novelty of the adaptation of the Old Testament, do not banish midrash from the Gospels.[1] Undoubtedly few contemporary exegetes are at home in this world of cherished, hinted grace. It may well be that in acknowledging the presence of a Christian midrashic outlook and technique in the Gospels, the obscure is being explained by the more obscure. But this difficulty cannot be shirked. - "Wer den Dichter will verstehen, muss in Dichters Lande gehen."

B. THE JEWISH *HERMENEUTIK* AND MATTHEW 1-2

1) *Matthew 1:1-17 - Times and Persons Graced*

a. The Numerical Ordering

A key to the genealogy is clearly the numerical ordering made explicit in verse 17: three sets of fourteen generations from Abraham, through David and the Babylonian deportation, to the Christ. Unfortunately, the ancient mystic science of numbers still guards its secrets. It is difficult for the modern mind to appreciate how numerical ordering was a primitive principle of abstract thought.[2] The quality of a number counted far more than

---

1 "Early Christian use of Scripture was not differentiated from contemporary Jewish midrash by some new hermeneutic . . . What caused a basic difference was new events and new experiences": N. A. Dahl, "The Atonement - An Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Ro 8:32)," *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (ed. E. E. Ellis), 29. Although it should be noted that these new events and experiences stimulated a fresh *Hermeneutik*, if not a hermeneutic. Also, Miller, "Targum, Midrash," 62-64; L. Zani, *"Abbiamo visto la sua stella": Studio su Mt 2,1-12* (Padova: [Tip. Antoniana], 1973) 19; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus* (cf. p. 65 n. 2), 22-23.

2 We add up figures to find their total, and thus go towards the unknown. "Les Anciens suivent un procédé inverse. Ils déterminent d'avance un total et, en fonction de celui-ci, ils dégagent des portions qui forment les articulations de la série": J. Meysing, "Contribution à l'étude des généalogies bibliques. Technique de la composition des chronologies babyloniennes du déluge," *RevScRel* 39 (1965) 209-229, at p. 227. He instances Josephus' placing of the migration of Abraham exactly half way between Noah's birth and the building of the temple. Cf. Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 190-191 (on 1 Chron 5:27-41 MT).

its quantity.[1] The First Gospel emphasizes three and fourteen, behind which probably loom seven and forty-two. Since the Semites considered two merely as an extension of one,[2] three is their first and lowest plural. Threefold repetition signifies that the subject concerned is complete, consummated, definitive.[3] The ancients concentrated on the numbers one to ten, and the "royal decade," twelve. Consequently, the number fourteen as such is not exploited by them. The obvious connection between fourteen and seven, however, lends the former an aura of the supernatural and man's relation to it, of royalty and divinity, of intensity and fulfilment.[4] The interplay of three and seven (or fourteen) imparts an eschatological resonance to Matthew's genealogy. Christ is the culmination of the divine order.

It remains to consider the significance of the numeral fourteen in Matthew's environment.[5] The evangelist could easily have found the digit in his Old Testament sources for the generations from Abraham to David,[6]

---

1 E.-B. Allo, *Saint Jean. L'Apocalypse* (EBib; 3rd ed.; Paris: Lecoffre/ Gabalda, 1933) XLI-XLIII. The overtones of biblical numbers are examined by J. B. Segal, "Numerals in the Old Testament," *JSS* 10 (1965) 2-20; and the articles in biblical dictionaries.

2 Segal, "Numerals," 2. On p. 14 he quotes Virgil, "Numero deus impare gaudet" (*Eclogues* VIII,75); and Shakespeare, "They say there is divinity in odd numbers" (*Merry Wives* V.i); and states that the Old Testament anticipated this tendency by using three and seven more frequently than any other digit, except perhaps the digit one.

3 G. Delling, "τρεῖς," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 216-225, 216, 218, 222.

4 See Segal, "Numerals," 15-16, who adds that it is connected with *rites de passage*, and is closely associated with seven in some texts (pp. 17-18); A. S. Kapelrud, "The Number Seven in Ugaritic Texts," *VT* 18 (1968) 494-499. Kapelrud says that at Ugarit seven signifies a maximum, and can be "loaded with strength and danger" (p. 499). All these overtones make seven eminently suitable for a time scheme of biblical eschatology.

5 Johnson (*Biblical Genealogies*, 189-208) gives an extensive bibliography. From the study of ten possible parallels, he prudently concludes that none of them can be shown to have directly influenced Matthew, but that they witness to a conception of history being divinely ordered towards a fulfilment. He believes Matthew shares this view (pp. 207-208).

6 See A. Vögtle, "Die Genealogie Mt 1,2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," *BZ* 8 (1964) 45-58, 239-262; 9 (1965) 32-49, at pp. 36-37; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 20; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 55 n. 1. The remarks of Johnson (*Biblical Genealogies*, 190-191) do not invalidate this observation.

viz., 1 Chronicles 1:34-2:15 (compare Ruth 4:12, 18-22). One attractive and possible explanation of the fourteen generations is, that the number comes from the numerical value of the consonants of the name David in Hebrew: דוד (= 4+6+4). This admirably suits the royal stamp of the genealogy.[1] Indeed, the arguments advanced against this messianic and Davidic interpretation are not conclusive: the genealogy is dependent on the Septuagint, not the Hebrew (but the Hebrew meaning of "Jesus" is presumed to be familiar in Matthew 1:21); David is spelled דויד in Chronicles and other later Old Testament books (however, Ruth has דוד; and the *yôd* would not enter the reckoning, since it is merely a *mater lectionis*); and, lastly, in Revelation 13:18 the gematria is explicit, as it would also be in Matthew, if intended (but in the Gospel the Davidic context makes the reference sufficiently clear). The equivalence between *DWD* and fourteen may possibly go back to the sixth century B.C.[2]

If evidence from Qumran indicates a popular computation, the number fourteen may (also) have a corporate dimension in the last days. According to the *War Scroll*, the great standard at the head of the congregation shall be fourteen cubits long (4:15), and shall have written on it, "The People of God," and fourteen names (3:12 - those of Israel, Aaron, and the twelve tribes). In 5Q15 fourteen cubits is frequently used as a measure in the New Jerusalem.[3] Such an eschatological ring would further stress in the genealogy that Jesus the Christ is the focus of Israel, and its Lord in these days of the Messiah.

The number fourteen also occurs in the apocrypha, often with apocalyptic connotations. The Ten Week Apocalypse of *1 Enoch* 91 and 93 can be

---

1 For scholars who reject or accept this interpretation, see Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 192-193. To those who doubt or reject gematria may be added: Baldi, *Infanzia*, 14; E. Pascual Calvo, "La Genealogía de Jesús según S. Mateo," *EstBib* 23 (1964) 145-146; J. A. Fitzmyer, *TS* 30 (1969) 703-704; Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 5; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 8; E. M. Peretto, "Ricerche su Mt 1-2," *Mar* 31 (1969) 152; Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key," 210; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 317.
But in favour are: Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 91; Hartman, "Scriptural Exegesis," 150; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 33 n. 14; Green, *Matthew*, 54.

2 Cf. P. W. Skehan, "Wisdom's House," *CBQ* 29 (1967) 468-486, 485-486.

3 A good translation, and precise references to DJD volumes and other publications, are found in G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (2nd ed.; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975) 122, 128-130, 262-264.

arranged so as to yield six weeks (that is, 6×7 = 42 = 3×14 of Matthew 1) between Abraham and the Christ.[1] The Messiah Apocalypse of *2 Baruch* 53-74 divides world history into fourteen epochs, more accurately, into twelve plus two.[2] A similar thought pattern is exemplified by *Exodus Rabbah* 15:26 (on Exodus 12:2), which divides the generations from Abraham to the Exile into two equal parts, according to the phases of the moon. Of these and other possible parallels, none is really close to Matthew 1. However, *if* the three fourteens of Matthew 1:17 may be rearranged as 7×6, there emerges a symbol of consummation (seven) allied to incompleteness (six, as in the number of the Beast, 666) until the coming of Christ: the time is now ripe for the work of the Messiah. It is quite possible that the forty-two stages of the journey from Egypt to the Promised Land listed in Numbers 33 reflect the same understanding of chronography on the part of the redactor of the Pentateuch as that of Matthew 1:17 - forty-two (6×7) recapitulates an epoch and introduces its climax.[3] However, all the generations before Matthew looked forward to the consummation. But the First Gospel looks around and backward to the fulfilment, using categories derived from contemporary Judaism. Matthew and Luke produce genealogies which are *sui generis*, because they are the sole extant pedigrees of the Messiah.[4]

---

1 Enoch is the seventh generation from Adam, as is Amram from Abraham. Similarly in Mt 1 Jesus is the seven times seventh generation descendant from Abraham (3×7+7). Thus, "Jésus inaugure le septième cycle de générations depuis Abraham, à la plénitude des temps" (Perrot, "Récits d'enfance," 500 n. 49).

2 Waetjen ("The Genealogy as Key," 210-215) reads too much into Mt 1:1-17.

3 J. T. Milik ("Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 [1971] 333-378, 357-358) detects an Enochic seventh world week inaugurated by Jesus in Mt 1. The 42 (40) connotes the mystical desert of the Essenes, prefiguring the entry into the Promised Land under the new Joshua. Actually, Origen and Jerome anticipated much of this interpretation. See the criticism of their developments in Baldi, *Infanzia*, 14; Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 191-192 n. 2. Nevertheless, this understanding of 42 as a period of divine preparation for the messianic age is solidly founded.

4 In the spirit of *Leviticus Rabbah* 1:3, some have sought the meaning of the genealogy in its etymology, rather than its numerology; e.g., W. G. Braude, "A Rabbinic Guide to the Gospels," *Scr* 19 (1967) 40-45, 42-44; F. Weinreb, *Die jüdischen Wurzeln des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (Lebendige Bausteine, 13: Zürich: Origo, 1972) 82-95, 134-136. Mt 1:1-17 is based on the Septuagint, which makes such consistent Semitic wordplay unlikely. Certainly it makes good sense without recourse to such subtleties.

b. The Five Women

Women feature in scriptural genealogies only where there is an irregularity of pedigree, or if her name has noteworthy associations, e.g., 1 Chronicles 2:21, 24, 34, 48-49; 7:24. The *Fragmentary Targum* and some other early writings frequently mention four ancestresses of Israel: Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah. Why does Matthew 1:1-17 mention four women before Mary? Tamar, Ruth, and Bathsheba have their place as wives of Judahites and ancestresses of David. But Rahab is not associated with the royal house in the Bible. She is absent from the apocrypha or pseudepigrapha and Philo; and she is never explicitly connected with the Davidids in the rabbinic writings.[1] Tamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba were sinners, but this aspect is not at all prominent in the Jewish tradition.[2]

Each of the first four women was very probably not considered a full Israelite by the compiler of the genealogy. The scriptures are explicit about the paganhood of Rahab the Canaanitess and Ruth the Moabitess. Tamar is dubbed a "daughter of Aram" by *Jubilees* 41:1 and the *Testament of Judah* 10:1; and Philo considers her to be of Gentile stock in *De virtutibus* §221. Since exogamy was outlawed in the first century, Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite, would automatically be adjudged to be non-Israelite.[3]

---

1 See Str-B 1.23 (and also pp. 15, 29-30); Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 162, and note qualification on p. 164. Interesting midrashic hypotheses are advanced by J. Winandy, *Autour de la naissance de Jésus* (Paris, 1970) 23; Y. Zakowitch, "Rahab als Mutter des Boas in der Jesus-Genealogie," *NovT* 17 (1975) 1-5.

2 Str-B 1.15-18. Tamar desired to share the messianic blessings: Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 30-31 (following R. Bloch); Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 159-161, who detects a hint that not all rabbis exonerated her; cf. A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: SPCK, 1974) 267-269, 303 n. 8. Rahab's profession of faith in Yahweh (Jos 2:9-13), and her hospitality to the apostles of the true God, impressed both Jew (*Ant.* 5.9-15; Str-B 1.20-21) and Christian (Jas 2:25; Heb 11:31; *1 Clem.* 12). Compare K. G. Kuhn, *Sifre zu Numeri* (Tannaitische Midraschim, 3; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1959) 203 n. 49. The "wife of Uriah" is completely overshadowed by David in the rabbinical writings, which tend to excuse his sin (Str-B 1.28-29).

3 In 1 Chron 3:5 Bathsheba is equated with the Canaanitess Bathshua of 1 Chron 2:3. Despite his interest in rabbinic polemic, M. D. Johnson exploits neither this, nor *Tg. Chron.* 2:17 on David being considered illegitimate because of Ruth. The weakness of *Biblical Genealogies* is that the four women are discussed in relation to Pharisaic disputation (pp. 152-179), rather than in function of the whole genealogy, Mary, and the Gospel's theology. Compare Waetjen, "The Genealogy as Key," 205-206.

Her Gentile origin is underscored by the fact that, unlike the other four women, she is denied a personal name, and referred to as "the wife of Uriah."[1] Pagans all four may be, but the Gentile uncleanness of Rahab and Ruth, and even of Tamar, falls away as they later emerge as proselytes.[2]

What association, if any, do these women have with Mary? She is not a sinner, but the vessel of a holy spirit and the virgin of prophecy. Neither is the betrothed of the righteous Davidid, Joseph, a Gentile.[3] Only the examination of the theology of the First Gospel can determine if the first four women have a role to play as righteous Gentiles and converts, and if they prepare for the mother of the Messiah. The final stage of the investigation is in Chapter 6, Section A, pages 118-119.

2) *Matthew 1:18-25 - The Roles of Holy Spirit and Joseph the Just*

a. That which is Generated in her is of Holy Spirit

Τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου. This phrase from Matthew 1:20 is the most neutral subheading. To have put "The Virgin Birth," or even "The Virginal Conception," would have misplaced the emphasis. The pericope states, but does not focus on, the fact that Mary was a virgin at the conception and the birth of the Christ, Jesus. Many themes may be detected in this passage. Yet any genetic analysis of its formation is precarious.[4] At its heart is obviously the identity and role of the "Son," the Davidic Emmanuel of holy spirit and prophecy. But the drama of the narrative lies in the divine initiative of the spirit in the virgin, and the mission of Joseph the Davidid, - both fulfilling Isaiah. The christological nucleus is so thoroughly integrated into Matthew's theology, that

---

1 See Zakowitch, "Rahab," 2-3; Green, *Matthew*, 53.

2 Cf. references in Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 159-165; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 30-31.

3 There is no significant material regarding Mary/Miriam in Mt 1-2 in R. Le Déaut, "Miryam, soeur de Moïse, et Marie, mère du Messie," *Bib* 45 (1964) 198-219.

4 The four steps in the development of Mt 1:18-25 discerned by K. Grayston ("Matthieu 1:18-25, Essai d'interprétation," *RTP* 23 [1973] 221-232) may be logically coherent, but he furnishes no solid evidence that "Matthew" shared this logic. Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 229-253, esp. pp. 242-243 and 251-253) is less precise and more convincing. His identification of three OT patterns is valid. He may be correct in positing a pre-Matthean apologetic slant, which is not operative in the present text (contrast Brown, *Messiah*, 142; - note distinction in n. 79 on p. 162).

its appreciation must be deferred until the last chapter.[1]

Turning to the first narrative element, the begetting of the Davidic Liberator through a holy spirit, it is necessary to keep two preliminary facts in mind. The tradition of Jesus' conception from a spirit antedates both Matthew 1:18-25 and Luke 1:30-35.[2] Moreover, it is not in dispute within the community of faith.[3] The pericope is not an apologia for the virtue of Mary. Rather does it stress the significance of the begetting from the spirit, and the virtue of Joseph the just. Secondly, three points common to the passages from Matthew and Luke have no essential interdependence, namely, divine sonship, generation by a holy spirit, and the exclusion of human fatherhood.[4] It is the relationship between the last two factors which is widely discussed. Does the activity of a holy spirit replace the paternity of Joseph? Or does it merely enhance normal marital relations?

---

1 See pp. 221-224, also 204-205, 232-234.

2 Pesch, "Ausführungsformel," 84, 88; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 60-63; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 60, 83; A. Vögtle, "Offene Fragen zur lukanischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte," *BibLeb* 11 (1970) 51-67, 52; G. Danieli, "A proposito delle origini della tradizione sinottica sulla concezione verginale," *DThom* 72 (1969) 312-331; Green, *Matthew*, 54; M. Miguens, *The Virgin Birth* (Westminster, Md., 1975) 108-110; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 252.

3 As shown by the fact that the Gospel makes but a passing reference to it; cf. preceding note and Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 11. It is wrong to classify Mt 1:18-25 as apologetic, in the sense of defending Mary against scurrilous rumours. The pericope speaks from faith to faith. Its concision would encourage scepticism rather than overcome it. In this sense, see Davies, *Setting*, 65-66; Pesch, "Ausführungsformel," 87 (citing A. Vögtle, G. Strecker, and F. Hahn); Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 61; Hill, *Matthew*, 77; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 16-17, 241-243, 251-252.
Compare Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 85-86; Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 158; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 100-101.
The contrary view is advocated by, among many others, Stendahl, "Quis et Unde?," 101; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 66-67; E. Stauffer, "Jeschu Ben Mirjam. Kontroversgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu Mk 6:3," *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (ed. E. E. Ellis) 119-128, 124-125; R. E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception* (New York, 1973) 25, 65-66; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament," *TS* 34 (1973) 541-575, 566.
See Brown, *Messiah*, 534-542: "Appendix V: The Charge of Illegitimacy."

4 Cf. Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 97; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 73-75; Brown, *Virginal Conception*, 41-42.
On the wider theological question of "The Religious Significance of the Virginal Conception," see McHugh, *Mother of Jesus* (cf. p. 65 n. 2), 330-342.

With increasing frequency scholars are searching for precedents to the gospel accounts of conception through a spirit in pagan, extra-Palestinian and Palestinian Jewish, and even early Christian (Pauline) sources. Their reasoning, which is rarely explicit, may thus be expressed: if a parallel can be found, then the evangelical virginal conception is probably derived from it; but since this parallel is purely mythical or a theologoumenon, the gospel story is but an image to convey the transcendence of Jesus. Such argumentation has two flaws. Similarity does not of itself postulate dependence. Secondly, even if a deliberate borrowing of extra-Christian notions by the evangelists or their tradition is shown to be probable, it remains to demonstrate that the borrowing extends to more than the mode of expression.[1]

Many explorations of the relationship of the conception of Jesus to contemporary religious culture have appeared.[2] Therefore, the present exposition may be curtailed to a minimum. If judgments passed appear peremptory, further justification for them will be found in the works cited in the notes. Two types of Jewish literature will be investigated for their possible contribution to understanding the generation of Jesus: the Egyptian Diaspora evidence of a virginal conception in the Septuagint Isaiah and Philo; and first century speculation on the origins of Melchizedek.

(i) *A virginal conception in the Egyptian Diaspora?* - The only serious claimant to be a pagan analogy with the Gospels' account of the conception of the Christ through a holy spirit is Plutarch's record of an Egyptian belief in his *Vita Numae Pompilii* 4:4. The text runs: καίτοι δοκοῦσιν οὐκ

---

1 How unsophisticated has been the search for parallels to the conception of Jesus by a virgin from a holy spirit, is shown by the important, interdisciplinary, methodological considerations of J. A. Saliba, "The Virgin-Birth Debate in Anthropological Literature: A Critical Assessment," *TS* 36 (1975) 428-454, esp. pp. 446-451

2 Recent studies include: Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 65-81; J. Hasenfuss, "Die Jungfrauengeburt in der Religionsgeschichte," *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute* (ed. H. J. Brosch), 11-23; Michl, "Jungfrauengeburt im NT," 174-183; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 97-109; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 60-63; Brown, *Virginal Conception*, 62-65; Fitzmyer, "Virginal Conception in NT," 550-551, 555-556, 565-566; Miguens, *Virgin Birth*, 118-122; and esp. J. McHugh, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (London, 1975) 278-321; Brown, *Messiah*, 517-533: "Appendix IV: Virginal Conception."

ἀπίθανως Αἰγύπτιοι διαιρεῖν, ὡς γυναικὶ μεν οὐκ ἀδύνατον πνεῦμα πλησιάσαι θεοῦ καί τινας ἐντέκειν ἀρχὰς γενέσεως. This may be rendered: "Yet Egyptians seem, not implausibly, to make a distinction - that it may be possible for the spirit of a god to have intercourse with a woman, and to produce in her the first beginnings of generation." Many scholars have compared this text, dating from about 100 A.D., with Matthew 1:20 and Luke 1:35, in order to demonstrate an Egyptian influence on them.[1] Presuming that the geographical distance was bridged, and that the strong biblical and Jewish colouring of the Gospel narrative would allow an idea injected from paganism, great differences still remain. Plutarch does not speak about a virginal conception, and does not even explicitly exclude a human father. Also, he shows himself extremely sceptical about the Egyptian opinion, even though his ideas of divinity and intermediary spirits would be much more fluid, and less monotheistic and refined, than those of the evangelists.[2]

However, presuming the reliability of Plutarch's information, it may be wondered if such an idea could have influenced the Alexandrian Greek version of Isaiah 7:14. The extant text, which is later than Matthew, reads: ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν. Certainly this verse has many words in common with both Matthew and Luke.[3] Yet the very absence of a (holy) spirit and divine filiation suffice to show that this "virgin" text did not create the evangelical tradition. A closer examination

---

1 Cf. H. Kleinknecht, "πνεῦμα," *TDNT* 6 (1968) 342-343 (referring to E. Norden); E. Brunner-Traut, "Die Geburtsgeschichte der Evangelien im Lichte ägyptologischer Forschungen," *ZRGG* 12 (1960) 97-111, esp. p. 105; also, "Pharao und Jesus als Söhne Gottes," *Antaios* 2 (1961) 266-284; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 79-81.

2 Compare J. G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (2nd ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1932; repr. Grand Rapids, 1967) 363 n. 109; Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 326 n. 111; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 73; Danieli, "Concezione verginale," 321-323; Brown, *Virginal Conception*, 62-63; Fitzmyer, "Virginal Conception in NT," 551 n. 33; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 296-300; and see G. Delling, "παρθένος," *TDNT* 5 (1967) 830; Brown, *Messiah*, 523-524, with nn. 17-18.

3 The extent to which Isa 7:14 has moulded the wording of Mt is evaluated by G. Danieli, "L'influsso reciproco di tradizione e commenti profetici nel vangelo di Matteo," *DThom* 71 (1968) 196-201; and cf. J. Michl, "Jungfrauengeburt im NT," 151-153; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 229-231, 239. A. Soubigou treats the passage Mt 1:18-25 as the realization of, and commentary on, Isa 7:14, in "L'évangile de l'enfance selon saint Matthieu," *Année Théologique* 9 (1948) 82-94, 88.

reveals that the Septuagint does not speak univocally[1] of an individual[2] virginal conception. Neither was its utility enhanced by any known pre-Christian messianic interpretation,[3] although the late oracle in Isaiah 9:5-6 reveals further religious reflection on it.[4] Consequently, if the received Septuagint *parthenos* text be accepted as antedating Matthew, this legacy of extra-Palestinian Judaism was less a stimulus to, than a vehicle for, the conception of Jesus in the Gospels of the Origins.

There remains another possible Egyptian witness. Philo of Alexandria speaks allegorically of Sarah as a virgin (i.e., endowed with spiritual discernment) who conceives from the divine seed. She, and Leah, Rebekah, and Zipporah, are virtues which can fructify only under the influence of

---

1 Neither Hebrew nor Greek have a term which invariably denotes a *virgo intacta*. See M. Rehm, "Das Wort *'almāh* in Is 7,14," *BZ* 8 (1964) 89-101; G. J. Wenham, "*Bᵉtûlâh* 'a girl of marriageable age'," *VT* 22 (1972) 326-348, esp. pp. 346-348. The pre-Christian Jewish tragedian Ezekiel calls wives who have not yet borne children *parthenoi*; cf. Michl, "Jungfrauengeburt im NT," 152 n. 30. For the rabbis a virgin is a woman who has never menstruated, although she may be the mother of children (according to Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 218-222).

2 For the possible identity of the virgin and child of Isa 7:14, consult R. Kilian, *Die Verheissung Immanuels Jes 7,14* (SBS 35; Stuttgart: KBW, 1968); Coppens, *Messianisme royal*, 69-76, 207-208 (with references); H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (BKAT 10/4; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969) 288-293; H. Haag, "Is 7,14 als alttestamentliche Grundstelle der Lehre von der Virginitas Mariae," *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute* (ed. H. J. Brosch), 137-144, 142-143. The collective interpretation of the verse is proposed in various ways by L. Köhler, G. Fohrer, O. Kaiser, L. G. Rignell, and H. Kruse (data in Kilian, pp. 84-92); and Waetjen, "The Genealogy as Key," 228-229.

3 Cf. Str-B 1.75; Haag, "Is 7,14," 143-144; Fitzmyer, "Virginal Conception in NT," 551; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 281-283.

4 On the background of Isa 9:5-6 in Egyptian royal ideology, see W. Schlisske, *Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament* (BWANT 97; Stuttgart, 1973) 78-88. Following W. Staerk, Räisänen (*Die Mutter Jesu*, 71) understands "the virgin" as the title of the Mother of the divine child, the heir to Pharaoh. R. Kilian, accepting E. Brunner-Traut, is of the same opinion, in "Die Geburt des Immanuel aus der Jungfrau: Jes 7,14," *Zum Thema Jungfrauengeburt* (Contributions from O. Knoch, K. Rahner, etc.; Stuttgart: KBW, 1970) 9-35, at pp. 32-34. Around the period of the production of the LXX Isaiah Alexandrian Jewry was drawing on the mystique of the Ptolemaic Saviour King in its third Sibylline Oracle; see J. J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13; Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1974) 38-44; and, "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment," *BASOR* 220 (1975) 27-36. Cf. also n. 2 on p. 42. Despite Fitzmyer (n. 3), this hypothesis is attractive.

God.[1] No modern interpreter would hold that Philo proposes a virginal conception and birth in the literal sense.[2] The point at issue is, does Philo in his extended metaphor reflect a popular Egyptian belief in a conception effected directly by God? Several considerations tell against this. Philo writes in a highly personal fashion, as his peculiar understanding of virginity shows. He explicitly claims to be basing his exposition on the scriptures, as one who was "initiated into the great mysteries under the guidance of Moses beloved by God," and who has recourse to the "skilled hierophant" Jeremiah. He alludes to Genesis 18:11; 21:1; 25:21; and to Jeremiah 3:14 (although not to Isaiah 7:14).[3] Nor does he make use of the

---

1 This is an over-simplification of Philo, *De cherubim* §§40-52 (esp. 49-50). On *aeiparthenos* (§51) qualifying Wisdom, unclouded by passion, see further M. Alexandre, *Philo: De congressu eruditionis gratia* (Paris, 1967) 235-236. *De cherubim* is associated with Mt 1 and Lk 1 by many, e.g., M. Dibelius, *Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind* (Heidelberg, 1932) 33-35, 42-43 (citing E. Norden); A. Jaubert, *La notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne* (Paris, 1963) 491-493; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 70-74; Brown, *Virginal Conception*, 64-65; Waetjen, "The Genealogy as Key," 224. That the evangelists draw on an Egyptian myth transmitted by Hellenistic Judaism is believed by R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (2nd ed; Oxford, 1968) 443-444; Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," 402; S. Schulz, "ἐπισκιάζω," *TDNT* 7 (1971) 400; Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 295-299, 325-327; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (Fontana Library; London, 1969) 195-196; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 14-15.

2 "Spiritual, or, as modern man might put it, psychological facts" (Machen, *Virgin Birth*, 305); Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, 9-10; Jaubert, *Alliance*, 491 - Philo's "théologie de la grâce"; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 73; S. Sandmel, *The First Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969) 120 - "purely theosophical"; R. A. Baer, *Philo's Use of the Categories Male and Female* (ALGHJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 51-64; P. Grelot, "La naissance d'Isaac et celle de Jésus. Sur une interprétation 'mythologique' de la conception virginale," *NRT* 94 (1972) 564-573; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 298.
Perrot ("Récits d'enfance," 489 n. 16) aptly observes that although Philo in *Legum allegoriae* 3, §219 says that, "The Lord begat Isaac; for He is Himself Father of the perfect nature, sowing and begetting happiness in men's souls," he earlier said, "Abraham evidently rejoices and laughs, because he is to beget Isaac (who is) Happiness."

3 On Philo's use of the OT here, see Michl, "Jungfrauengeburt im NT," 176-177; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 105-106, who shows how he differs from the evangelists; Grelot, "Naissance d'Isaac," 562-568; Miguens, *Virgin Birth*, 120-122; Isaacs, *Concept of Spirit*, 120; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 314-319.

hypothetical Egyptian notion of a divine spirit impregnating a mortal woman. Indeed, if there did exist in Egypt a widespread pagan belief in a divine (non-virginal) conception,[1] Philo would seem to be demythologizing it by a sheerly spiritual interpretation![2] In short, Philo does not appear to show any positive dependence on any such Egyptian notion. As far as is known, he is an author without extensive influence who speculates on the Old Testament. If, despite difference of terminology and intention, he here has an implicit reference to pagan belief in a divine impregnation, his attitude is one of critical reaction.

(ii) *The supernatural origin of Melchizedek.* - According to the possibly pre-Christian Slavonic, or 2 *Enoch* 23, Melchizedek is conceived in a mysterious manner, without human intervention. His actual birth also appears to be miraculous. The context is strongly sacerdotal, with its mention of cultic continence, and concern for the continuity of the legitimate priest-

---

1 Hans Leisegang (1922) would trace this hypothetical belief from enthusiastic hellenistic religion, which would have influenced Diaspora piety. See the lengthy exposé and critique of his work in McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 300-308. Following E. Norden, Dibelius (*Jungfrauensohn*, 43-49) distinguishes between an Egyptian belief in conception through a divine spirit, and the more widespread heathen idea of a virginal conception. These two strands would have merged in Ptolemaic times, and Egyptian Judaism would have propagated the myths about the spirit and the virgin in Palestine. However, G. Guthknecht proposes that the virgin motif came directly from the non-Egyptian hellenistic mystery cults (cf. Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 107-108). Such a diversity of opinions shows how fragile is the basis on which theories about an Egyptian theologoumenon are erected.

2 Even if such a notion were implicit in Philo's exposition, it is rejected by being sublimated from the biological sphere. The "timid" conclusion of A. Paul (*L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 81) that Mt's explanation of the conception of Jesus "s'inspire plus ou moins dans son expression, semblerait-il, de cette manière grecque (poétique chez Eschyle, plus spéculative chez Plutarque) de traduire les mythes égyptiens," is too hasty. Compare his statement of the "influence évidente" of Hellenistic Judaism (p. 74); but contrast his later discounting of rabbinic influence: "Aussi, est-ce presque exclusivement avec l'Ancien Testament que nous devons nous éclairer sur l'action de l'Esprit dans le sein de Marie" (p. 86). If the scriptures are so important, what place is left to pagan myths? Any possible pagan echoes of *pneuma* and *parthenos* should be weighed against the massive OT influence: holy spirit, Davidic saviour, Christ, angel, annunciation, Obedience Formula. J. Hasenfuss ("Jungfrauengeburt," 22-23) is much more circumspect in his conclusion that too little is known about possible heathen influences either to affirm or to deny them. P. Grelot ("Naissance d'Isaac," 568-570) is far more resolute in his rejection of the supposed theologoumenon.

hood during the catastrophe of the Flood. It is difficult to see why this supernatural, though not virginal or spirit-worked, conception should be interpolated by a Christian.[1] On the other hand, *11Q Melchizedek* suggests an early curiosity about this man without father or mother, as well as a tendency to make him an angelic figure, and possibly a hypostasis of God.[2] But such speculation sits ill with the popular, magical, and staccato story in Slavonic *Enoch*. Here Melchizedek is not messianic, and his conception presents no close parallel to the Gospel of the Origins. The passage does, however, show that a begetting through the sole power of God was accepted by some Jews in the first century.[3] An aura of the supernatural surrounds both the origin and the person of Melchizedek, which is surely part of the Jewish matrix of Matthew 1:18-25.

Conclusion. - Three independent elements common to Matthew 1:18-25 and Luke 1:26-35 were listed at the beginning of this section: divine sonship, generation by a holy spirit, and virginal conception (page 64). Not even two of them have been found joined explicitly in the extra-evangelical documents examined. It is not impossible that Egyptian mythology may have used expressions reminiscent of the Gospels, but this has not been demonstrated, or even shown to be probable. There are numerous examples of supernatural procreation. But the conceptions are not those of a virgin, nor from a "holy" spirit. And the offspring are not messianic. The idea of divine sonship is absent, or certainly not explicit.[4]

---

1 Against Brown, *Virginal Conception*, 63 with n. 105; Miguens, *Virgin Birth*, 119-120. *2 Enoch* differs from Heb 7 in its silence about the Davidic messiah, and in providing Melchizedek with a genealogy!

2 The esoteric Melchizedek lore is conveniently summarized by M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (London, 1976) 80-83.

3 Compare Perrot, "Récits d'enfance," 490-492; K. Schubert, *Jésus à la lumière du judaïsme du premier siècle* (LD 84; Paris: Le Cerf, 1974) 22-28; Hengel, *Son of God*, 82; Grelot, *Au seuil*, 118-119.

4 The notion of a human being the offspring of a god was not so widely diffused in the pagan world as once was thought. W. von Martitz ("υἱός," *TDNT* 8 [1972] 339-340) finds that θεῖος ἀνήρ is not a fixed expression in the pre-Christian era, and is not associated with divine sonship. See also Hengel, *Son of God*, 30-31; H. C. Kee, *Community of the New Age. Studies in Mark's Gospel* (NT Library; London: SCM, 1977) 17-18, 120, 185 n. 72.

The important conclusion of this inquiry into the first century Jewish background to the role of a holy spirit in the genesis of Jesus is a negative one. The extant literature furnishes no significant parallel. The work of a divine spirit in bringing the Davidic liberator into existence is accepted and respected. It is a reality which Joseph trusts and obeys, not a fact which is measured and dissected.[1] First century Judaism knew that God alone can do his own characteristic work - salvation; and that this is done through his holy spirit, and in accordance with the eternal covenant with David.

b. Joseph did as the Angel of the Lord commanded him

The other parameter against which Matthew 1:18-25 must be gauged is the role of Joseph. This "just" son of David is depicted reacting to a situation directly brought about by the Lord. Several features of the narrative impart an air almost of normality and everyday moral choice to the crucial occasion. The sober portrayal of revelation by dreams, with the period phrase κατ' ὄναρ,[2] reflect the religious idiom of the age. Contemporary marriage customs have been detected in Matthew 1:18-20.[3] The Synoptics regularly use ἀπολύειν (1:19) for divorce, but this seems to be a recent usage, since this acceptation is found only once in the Septuagint

---

1 "Holy spirit" does not have the definite article in 1:18, 20. This vagueness may be indicative of an undeveloped theology of the s/Spirit. In this at least one can concur with Miguens, *Virgin Birth*, 38: "There is nothing specifically Christian about it." (Although Paul earlier connected sonship to God with the outpouring of the holy Spirit). On the contemporary Jewish notion of spirit, see E. Sjöberg, "πνεῦμα," 383-388; and works cited p. 32 n. 1, esp. Isaacs. At least after about 70 A.D., the holy spirit is never identical with God; cf. A. M. Goldberg, *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur* (Studia Judaica, 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969). It is not without interest that 1QapGen col. 2 presumes that Noah could have been generated by a Holy One or Son of Heaven or Watcher.

2 Κατ' ὄναρ is confined to Matthew in the Bible; and is a recent term, which Philo contrasts with the worthless ἐνύπνια. See further W. Soltau, "Zur Entstehung des I. Evangeliums," *ZNW* 1 (1900) 219-248, 239; the works by Oepke and Balz cited in n. 2 on p. 31; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 167.

3 Str-B 1.45-47; M'Neile, *Matthew*, 6-7; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 12-13; Grundmann, *Matthew*, 68; F. Zinniker, *Probleme der sogenannten Kindheitsgeschichte bei Matthäus* (Freiburg i. Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1972) 154-166; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 158-163.
On Mary's status of "wife-virgin," see Miguens, *Virgin Birth*, 64-70.

(*1 Esdras* 9:36), and elsewhere is quite rare and unclassical.[1] Another word with a contemporary flavour is δειγματίζειν (1:19), which is not found in the Septuagint, and occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Colossians 2:15. The verb can have a neutral sense, like "display," "exhibit," "publicize."[2] However it tends to share the univocal pejorative sense of its rather more common compound παραδειγματίζειν.[3]

A good man was regularly termed δίκαιος.[4] The righteousness of Joseph in Matthew 1-2 bears a close resemblance to that of the patriarch in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, who practised two virtues in a signal fashion. In the first half of the Testament of Joseph he is heroic in his chastity - σωφροσύνη (4:1-2; 6:7; 9:2-3; 10:2-3, and only here in *Testaments*). In the second half of his Testament Joseph is outstanding in his love for his brothers, whom he alone of the patriarchs addresses in the exordium (1:2). His particular concern for his brothers is the same as that of Joseph for Mary. He wishes to avoid putting them to shame (11:2; 15:3; 17:1-2; cf. 10:6; 16:6), and to rescue them in Egypt. Unlike Genesis his mastery of dreams is not mentioned. But, as elsewhere in the *Testaments*, an angel reveals what is to come. In 6:6 the angel of the God of his father informs him of the unchastity of Potiphar's wife. This is a striking contrast to Matthew 1:20. The patriarch was like in all things to his father Jacob (18:4). Matthew's Joseph is also a son of Jacob (1:16); and the patriarch's mother, Rachel, mourns over his "family" (2:18).[5]

---

1 Cf. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 250.

2 J. M. Germano, "Nova et vetera in pericopam de sancto Joseph," *VD* 46 (1968) 351-360, 354-355; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 168-169.

3 F. Prat, "Le triomphe du Christ sur les principautés et les pouvoirs," *RSR* 3 (1912) 201-229, 216-217; H. Pernot, *Les deux premiers chapitres de Matthieu et de Luc* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1948) 73-74.

4 Note Lk 1:6; 2:25; Mt 23:35; 2 Pet 2:7; Josephus, *Ant.*, 1:2; Moore, *Judaism*, 1.494. Extensive references for the meaning of *dikaios* in the first century are given by C. Spicq, "'Joseph, son mari, étant juste ...' (Mt. I,19)," *RB* 71 (1964) 206-214. Justice can be allied to mercy, as Spicq holds, without excluding obedience to the Torah - despite D. Hill, "A Note on Matthew I,19," *ExpT* 76 (1964/65) 133-134; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 12. Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 247-250) is needlessly subtle.

5 See also the contributions by R. I. Pervo and W. Harrelson in G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Studies on the Testament of Joseph* (SBLSCS 5; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975); Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key," 226-227.

The righteousness of Joseph plainly consists in his obedience. He resolves to submit to the law requiring the repudiation of an unfaithful fiancée; and he obeys the angel and the implied demands of Isaiah 7:14 in the concluding verses (1:24-25), which are rigidly structured according to the biblical obedience formula. This pattern is more frequent in the Septuagint than the Hebrew, indicating a growth in popularity towards the Christian era. A work probably written during the century previous to Matthew presents an interesting parallel to the obedience formula. *Genesis Apocryphon* column 21, lines 15-19, is an addition to the text of Genesis 13:17. It describes Abraham executing the command he received from God, in a manner similar to Matthew 1:24-25. The supplementing of the sacred text with an account of the literal fulfilment of the will of God is all the more remarkable in view of the work's general sobriety, and adherence to the Genesis story. The explanation of this comparative freedom may be the contemporary concern for painstaking fulfilment of the will and word of Yahweh. This concern is patent in the angelic message, the quotation from Isaiah, and the obedience formula of 1:20-25. Even the dilemma of Joseph in verses 18-20 reflects the refined religious sensibilities of a true first century Jew.

3) *Matthew 2:1-23 - Magi, Midrashim, and Holy Land*

It is convenient to examine the probable influence on Matthew 2 of the contemporary Jewish religious outlook under three headings: the background to the star and the magi; the apparent echoes of haggadic stories about various heroes of Israel; and the "prophetic geography" of Bethlehem and Galilee.

a. The Star and the Magi

It is widely held that the star of Matthew 2:1-12 has only a literary existence, that it is purely a theological symbol.[1] The "tradition stellaire" about the person of the Messiah in the Septuagint and the Palestinian targum (*Targum Yerušalmi I* and *II*, and *Targum Neofiti 1*) has been

---

1 For example, Vögtle, "Genealogie," 249-251 (implicitly); Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 115; S. Muñoz Iglesias, "Les mages et l'étoile," *AsSeign* 12 (1969) 19-31, 26; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 120; K. Gutbrod, *Die "Weihnachtsgeschichten" des Neuen Testaments* (Biblisches Seminar; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1971) 46.

adequately summarized by André Paul.[1] He also traces this tradition in Qumran. In the *Damascus Document* 7:18-21 the star of Numbers 24:17 represents the Interpreter of the Law, and the sceptre of the same verse stands for the Prince of the whole congregation. However, it appears to refer solely to the royal messiah in the *War Scroll* 11:6 and *4Q Testimonia* 12-13. The implicit reference in Numbers to the royal associations of the star is explicit in all versions of the Palestinian Targum; in the *Testament of Levi* 18:3; in Revelation 22:16 ("I Jesus . . . am the root and offspring of David, the bright morning star"; compare 2:26-28); and in Matthew 2:2: "Where is the new-born King of the Jews? It was his star that we saw at its rising, and so we have come to do him homage."[2] The fact that Jewish tradition associates the star with the person of the Messiah of David, and not with any heavenly phenomenon, does not exclude an implicit reference of Matthew 2 to Numbers 24:17. From the standpoint of its literary antecedents, the basic meaning of the star is that King Messiah has come on the scene.

The contemporary status of magi requires investigation.[3] Towards the

---

1 *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 106-112 (pp. 112-115 deal with another element of the star king tradition, namely, his universal sway, as brought out by the targums to Num 24:7). For the OT royal messianic interpretation at the base of the targums, see K. Seybold, "Das Herrscherbild des Bileamsorakels Num. 24,15-19," *TZ* 29 (1973) 1-19. See further, S. Cipriani, "Il senso messianico degli oracoli di Balaam (Num 23-24)," in *Il Messianismo. (Atti della XVIII Settimana Biblica, 1964)* (Brescia: Paideia, 1966) 57-83, esp. pp. 74-80; Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 20; Brown, *Messiah*, 195-196, also pp. 170-171 on the pagan background.

2 Ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων: the participle used attributively between the article and the noun is equivalent to an adjectival, not a substantival, participle in Matthew; cf. N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1965) 26. The rest of the translation attempts to render in idiomatic English the slight emphasis of αὐτοῦ (though see Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 283), the technical term ἀνατολή, and the slightly awkward γάρ.

3 Note A. D. Nock in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I. *The Acts of the Apostles* (eds. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1935) 164-188; J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés. Zoroastre, Ostanes et Hystaspe d'après la tradition grecque*, Tome I: *Introduction*; Tome II: *Les textes* (Paris: Les belles lettres, 1938); Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 143-147, 151-156 (with bibliography); Derrett, "Further Light," 97-98, 107 n. 100. On the archaeological evidence, see R. N. Frye, "Problems in the Study of Iranian Religions," in *Religions in Antiquity* (StHistRel 14; ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 583-589, esp. p. 586.

opening of the Christian era magi were connected with Persia and the cult of Mithras. In Iran archaeologists have cut down through the Sassanian and Parthian strata to reach the earliest monumental levels, but no mithraeum has yet been found. Consequently dependence on literary evidence for knowledge of magi is inevitable. Such evidence speaks of Mithras being reincarnated in a child saviour, who is borne to earth by a fiery star. Magi, who have scanned the heavens for this star, worship him in the "Treasure Cave," and offer him their crowns. This legend is held to be post-Christian, or at least independent of the Gospel story.[1] The influence of the magi spread westwards to Asia Minor, and percolated throughout the hellenistic world.[2]

Jewish society could not remain impervious to this general culture. The Old Testament reflects the absorption and purification of astral myths.[3] The Wisdom of Solomon is lenient towards those who worshipped the handiwork of God, "the circle of the stars . . . or the luminaries of heaven" (13:1-9); although severe towards those who worship idols, the work of their own hands (13:10-15, 19). Qumran has yielded some ten copies of a writing which depicts Abraham as turning from star worship to the one, true

---

1 Cf. G. Widengren, *Les religions de l'Iran* (Bibliothèque historique: Collection "Les religions de l'humanité"; Paris: Payot, 1968) 235-243, esp. pp. 243 and 238-239. In n. 1 to p. 243 (not in original German: Stuttgart, 1965) he lists seven criticisms of the method of J. Duchesne-Guillemin ("Die Magier in Bethlehem und Mithras als Erlöser," *ZDMG* 111 [1961] 469-473), who follows E. Norden in claiming a pre-Christian theologoumenon of a redeeming child connected with sun worship. See also Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 152.

2 See, in general, Bidez and Cumont, *Mages hellénisés*; and J. B. McMinn, "Fusion of the Gods: A Religio-Astrological Study of the Interpenetration of the East and the West in Asia Minor," *JNES* 15 (1956) 201-213, who says astrology is contributory to syncretism "and expresses itself particularly in an astral worship embellished with sidereal mythology and with a propensity for magi and mysticism" (p. 201).

3 L. Koep, "Astrologia usque ad Evangelium concessa. Zu Tertullian, De Idololatria 9," *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser* (JAC Ergänzungsband 1; Münster: Aschendorf, 1964) 199-208, esp. pp. 201-204, 206-207; S. Bartina, "Mitos astrales en la Biblia," *EstE* 43 (1968) 327-344; J. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians* (SBT 2/26; London: SCM, 1973), Ch. VI, "Astral Beliefs in Judah and the Ancient World," pp. 45-59, with valuable notes on pp. 108-119; and also, Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 90-92, on the association of stars with saviour figures in the hellenistic world.

God.[1] The Qumran covenanters may have dabbled in astrology. However, it is by no means assured that the messianic horoscope identified by Jean Starcky is either messianic, or even a horoscope.[2] In the post-New Testament era, a similar accomodating attitude towards astrology is shown by rabbinic writings of the earliest period.[3] There is even a certain cautious respect shown for the influence of the heavenly bodies - a respect which survives in the writings of Thomas Aquinas! Rabbis allow that stars have power over Gentiles, although not over Jews.[4] Astrology is connected with the east, as in the Old Testament, which calls the Chaldeans, "those who divide the heavens, who gaze at the stars, who at the new moons predict what shall befall" (Isaiah 47:13). According to *Koheleth Rabbah* 8:23 (and parallels) it is part of the famed wisdom of the children of the east - 1 Kings 5:10; Job 1:3.

The very restricted acceptance of astrology by Jewry, or at least the absence of its wholesale condemnation, in the later Old Testament, the New Testament, and the rabbinic periods, suggests a not entirely unfavourable attitude. In fact there are some positive indications that such was the

---

1 *Jubilees* 12:16-21; cf. E. Fascher, "Abraham, *phusilogos* und *philos theou*. Eine Studie zur ausserbiblischen Abrahamtradition im Anschluss an Deuteronomium 4,19," *Mullus*, 111-124.

2 See Fitzmyer, "'Elect of God'," as reprinted with slight additions in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London, 1971) 127-160, with his references to Starcky (p. 128 n. 3), J. Carmignac (p. 140 n. 19), and J. M. Allegro (p. 155 n. 29). Fitzmyer suggests that 4QMess ar is not an astrological calculation of the birth and appearance of the messiah. Instead he relates it to the literature on the birth of Noah. Further information on the interest in astrology in the Qumran milieu is provided by M. Delcor, "Recherches sur un horoscope en langue hébraïque provenant de Qumrân," *RevQ* 5 (1966) 521-542, 533-542.

3 Cf. references to *Mekilta deRabbi Ishmael* 1:112 and *Sifre* 11:318 in S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs, and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E. - IV Century C.E.* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950) 130 n. 8.

4 See Str-B 2.402-403; S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine. Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II-IV Centuries C.E.* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1942) 97-100. Lieberman cites the Christian astrologer from Syria, Bardesanes (circa 154-222), - who was later excommunicated - in support of the immunity of Jews from astral forces. Compare E. E. Urbach, *The Sages - Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975) 276-277.

case. In the *Jewish War* 5, §217, Josephus ascribes a cosmic symbolism to the Babylonian curtain in the Holy Place, which had embroidered on it some of the secrets of the heavens. The seven lamps represented the planets; and the twelve loaves of proposition the circle of the zodiac and the year. Even if this account is accomodated to his non-Jewish readership, the very fact that an educated Judaean member of a priestly family, once a Pharisee, could employ such imagery, indicates a familiarity with astrology in Palestine. The two magi in Acts appear in an unfavourable light; although the Samaritan Simon is said to have believed and been baptized (Acts 8:13), and the Jew Bar-Jesus is afflicted with only temporary blindness (Acts 13:11) - as was Paul in 9:6-12. With the exception of Pseudo-Philo, Balaam in Jewish and Christian writings is a symbol of perversion.[1] In the *Biblical Antiquities* Balaam is a tragic hero, who is intent on doing the will of God. The occurrence of the Greek loanword μάγος in Codex Neofiti shows how the term was common currency in Palestine in the early Christian era.[2]

After having outlined the Iranian, hellenistic, biblical, Jewish, and first century appreciation of astrology and magi, it remains to find a possible life setting for the magi episode. From the meagre and often ambiguous sources on the earliest non-Greek Christianity, Jean Daniélou deduced a connection between the magi and Damascus (*Damascus Document* 7:18-21; Justin, *Dialogue* 78:9) or Syria (Dositheus; Ignatius, *Ephesians* 19:2-3; Pseudo-Clementine Writings). He also points to the Ebionites, or converted Essenes, who migrated to Damascus. They sought refuge among the Jewish Christians at Kokhba, some fifteen kilometres south west of the city, according to Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30.2.18; 18.1. A confirmation of the activity of magi in Syria is their later refutation by Tatian and Bardesanes. This conjunction of evidence leads Daniélou to frame the hypothesis that

---

1 For instance, Josh 13:22; 2 Pet 2:15; Jude 11; Rev 2:14. See Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 127-177, esp. pp. 173-174; C. Spicq, *Les épîtres de saint Pierre* (SB; Paris: Gabalda, 1966) 237-238; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 278-279.

2 *Magos* is one of the nineteen Greek words of *Tg. Neof.* listed by Le Déaut, *Nuit pascale*, 43-44. Others are *genesis* (Mt 1:1,18) and *dōron* (Mt 2:11). There is a fragment from Qumran Cave 4 about a magus at the Persian court. Given the esteem in which they were held in the Levant, magi are rightly termed "gewissermassen die geistige Elite der Heiden" by Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 151. Contrast the unlikely suggestion of Derrett, "Further Light," 108.

the star belongs to Jewish Christian preaching in Syria, where their brothers in the faith were being led astray by eastern magi, who were to become the first non-hellenized gnostics. The description of the magi doing homage to the infant Messiah would be intended to counteract the attractions of the Syrian magi for Jewish Christians. This kerygma appeals to the prophecy about the magus Balaam after the fashion of Paul's invocation of Aratos at Athens, and the appropriation of the Sibylline oracles by Egyptian Christians.[1]

The great advantage of this hypothesis is, that the star and the magi receive some kind of credible setting in contemporary life. But difficulties remain. The magi of Matthew have none of the more reprehensible traditional traits. They are not interpreters of dreams, sorcerers, or moral perverts and false prophets, like the Balaam of popular Jewish tradition. Rather are they men seeking truth in the movements of God's heavens. They come from the east, the traditional home of astrology and wisdom. But pagan science is incapable of guiding them to the King of the Jews. They must pass through Jerusalem and be enlightened by the Jewish scriptures.

---

1 J. Daniélou, "l'Étoile de Jacob et la mission chrétienne à Damas," *VC* 11 (1957) 121-138, esp. pp. 131-138. Some support for his general position about the importance of the Qumran or Essene element outside Palestine proper is found in articles in his Festschrift: *RSR* 60 (1972) - O. Cullmann, "Courants multiples dans la communauté primitive. A propos du martyre de Jacques fils de Zébédée," pp. 55-68, 58-59; W. D. Davies, "Paul and Jewish Christianity according to Cardinal Daniélou: A Suggestion," pp. 69-79, 76-77. But Daniélou is on unsure ground when he speaks of Num 24:17 as part of the Testimonia that early Christianity received from Qumran; and when he describes *T. 12 Patr.* as a Syrian work (pp. 124-126). However, his respect for the Aramean Christianity of Eastern Syria, as distinct from the more Greek-leaning community at Antioch, has been borne out by more recent research; cf. the studies by Gibson, Quispel, and Barnard in A. F. J. Klijn, "Christianity in Edessa and the Gospel of Thomas. *On Barbara Ehlers, Kann das Thomasevangelium aus Edessa stammen?*," *NovT* 14 (1972) 70-77, 71 nn. 1 and 3. An early penetration of Christianity into (As)Syria, and possible contacts with eastern magi, are also favoured by the cultural situation there even after the first century. Cities like Damascus, Palmyra, and Edessa retained their oriental feudal character under the rule of priest-kings; cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (2d ed. revised by P. M. Frazer; Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), 1. 269, 272-273; also, Bidez and Cumont, *Mages hellénisés*, 1. 41-52, esp. p. 47; Safrai and Stern, *Jewish People* I/1, 171, 179 n. 3 (M. Stern). This Syrian and North Transjordan locale is more credible than the Petra region proposed by Charbel, "Nabatei," 575-583. It also coheres with Hull, *Hellenistic Magic*, 122-128.

Only then does the king's star show them the Christ. After their adoration they become like the obedient Joseph, receiving a divine command in a dream and carrying it out. Like the early Christians, they must distance themselves from unbelieving Jewry (Matthew 2:12). This picture of the magi is too serene, too integrated with the Gospel's themes of the primacy and imperfection of Judaism[1] and of the Davidic Messiah, to be explained as a kerygma to bolster the fidelity of Syrian Christians awed by the prestige of local magi. Nevertheless, Daniélou's investigation does give a certain density to Matthew's sparely etched idyll of the pilgrimage of the sages from the east to their King.

The possible extra-biblical background is not yet exhausted. The Ordinarius for Theoretical Astronomy at Vienna University believes he can explain the motion and immobility of the magi's star by the behaviour of the planet Jupiter in November of 7 B.C.[2] The Babylonians connected Jupiter with Marduk, thus making it the "royal star." The phenomenon of the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the sign of Pisces, which occurs about once every thousand years, is predicted for 7 B.C. in a planetary calendar dating from 8 B.C.[3] Whatever conclusions are to be drawn from the fact, there was a "star" - Jupiter - about the time of the birth of Christ which corresponds to the star of the magi.[4] It had great significance in the

---

1 Cf. Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 16, 21, 79-80. On the theme of salvation and the word of God coming from the Jews, see Deut 4:8; Ps 147:19-20; Isa 2:2-3; Rom 3:1-2; 9:4-8; and also Acts 18:5-7; 19:8-10; Lk 24:47, with the comments of G. W. H. Lampe, *St. Luke and the Church of Jerusalem* (Ethel M. Wood Lecture, 1969; London: Athlone, 1969) 17-20.

2 K. Ferrari d'Ochieppo, *Der Stern*, 31-102; and compare D. W. Hughes in *Nature* 264 (December 9, 1976) 513, who dates three conjunctions in 7 B.C.

3 Cf. M. Zerwick, *VD* 47 (1969) 48. Since attention is concentrated on the royal star, this hypothesis is compatible with the insistence that ἀστήρ refers to a single star, and not a constellation; cf. F. Boll, "Der Stern der Weisen," *ZNW* 18 (1917/18) 40-48. First century Judaism may have understood the conjunction of the planet of righteousness (Jupiter) with that of cosmic order (Saturn) as the granting by Yahweh to his Messiah of the power to establish justice, according to R. A. Rosenberg, "The 'Star of the Messiah' Reconsidered," *Bib* 53 (1972) 105-109, 108-109. Pisces is the ultimate sign of the zodiac, and therefore suited to the days of the Messiah. See also, Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 148; Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 81-82; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 283 n. 236, 290-291.

4 The astronomical phenomena visible in Palestine in 7-4 B.C. are listed by H. W. Montefiore, "Josephus and the New Testament," *NovT* 4 (1960) 139-160, 307-318, at pp. 141-144. See further references in n. 2 above.

ancient Near East, and was eminently suited to herald the King Messiah. Given the spirit of the age, there is no reason to doubt that Jupiter's extraordinary appearance attracted some of the well-disposed tó the Sun of Justice.

Dating from about the end of the second century, the fresco in the house of the Christians at Dura-Europos shows two stars above the tomb of Jesus. They are taken to represent the two angels that announced the resurrection.[1] Similarly the star of the magi could possibly represent an angel. First century apocalyptic symbolism witnesses to this identification: "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches" (Revelation 1:20).[2] In Matthew, however, astronomical elements are to the fore - ἀνατολή in the technical sense of the rising of a star, and Herod's inquiry about the time of its appearance. Also, magi from the east are effortlessly associated with the lore of the skies. While these considerations dissuade from identifying the star of Matthew 2 as an angel, the Dura fresco does support a wide range of possible applications of the star - astral phenomenon, angel, messianic King.[3]

---

1 J. Villette, "Que représente la grande fresque de la maison chrétienne de Doura?," *RB* 60 (1953) 398-413. Her explanation is adopted by C. H. Kraeling, *Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report* VIII, Part II, *The House of the Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967). Cf. Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 154 n. 65.

2 The West tended to understand the stars as the teaching bishops; note Dan 12:3; Mal 2:7; *Tg. Yer. 1* to Ex 40:4. But the context in Rev favours the Eastern interpretation of the stars as angels; cf. A. Feuillet, *The Apocalypse* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1965) 49, to which may be added the more recent commentaries by T. F. Glasson, G. B. Caird, and W. J. Harrington.

3 The contemporary Jewish interest in astrology has been illustrated. It is scarcely a coincidence that both Philo (*De Abr.* 17-18, §§77-84) and Josephus (*Ant.* 1.156-157) state that Abraham had to leave Chaldaea because he attributed the beneficial effects of the heavenly bodies to God, and not to the universe. The ancient Near East readily compared rulers to the sun or a star; see Cipriani, "Senso messianico," 72 and n. 34. For Israel, note Isa 14:12 (king of Babylon); Ezek 32:7 (Pharaoh); Pss 89:36-37; 110:3; 132:17. As C. Perrot ("Récits d'enfance," 487 n. 12) has pointed out, first century Judaism understood a star as announcing not a birth, but royalty, and Rev 22:16 and Mt 2 stress the Davidic origin of Jesus by means of one. The star of the magi has, therefore, a political or theocratic colouring. In line with ancient court etiquette David is called the "lamp of Israel," e.g., 2 Sam 21:17; 1 Kgs 11:36; 15:4; 2 Kgs 8:19; 2 Chron 21:7.

Conclusion. - Qumran twice understands the star of Numbers 24:17 as the Messiah, but the *Damascus Document* applies it to the interpreter of the law. Magi were astronomers, oneirocritics, diviners, and counsellors of rulers. They were familiar, and generally respected, throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, as well as Mesopotamia and Persia. The Jews showed a certain tolerance of astrology, although the followers of Balaam the magus were - with the exception of Pseudo-Philo - roundly condemned. The targumic tradition interprets the star of Numbers as the Davidic Christ who will rule the Gentiles.

Matthew's magi differ from the current Jewish estimation in being presented in a wholly favourable light. Their worship is a foil to disbelieving Jerusalem, which nevertheless has enlightened their incipient faith with the words of scripture. Not long before the probable date of the birth of Jesus (6 B.C.), a celestial phenomenon occurred which could have stimulated the elaboration of a story about the appearance of the royal messianic star of contemporary expectation. If the star is a natural happening as well as a symbol, its association with the conversion of well-disposed pagans is more readily explicable. In Palestine and Syria magi were probably won over to the faith. Thus Matthew 2 shows both the baptism of astrology and the fulfilment of the Old Testament. It does so against the background of the privilege and perdition of establishment Jewry.

Therefore neither a purely literary nor a literalistic understanding of Matthew 2:1-12 does most justice to the first century background. The birth at Bethlehem, the kingship of the Davidid, the strange star, the magi, the fulfilment of prophecy, the conversion of righteous Gentiles, the opposition of the Herods and Jerusalem, the separation from official Jewry - all these are more than literary realities. They are history, although not necessarily in the chronological succession of the pericope. The First Gospel surely did not intend the story to be accepted as reportage. But neither did it draw everything from books, not even sacred Books.[1]

---

1 The question of the historicity of Mt 1-2 lies outside the scope of this work. But Christology cannot be divorced from the experience of reality. Some "facts" must exist, if the light of theological reflection is not to be projected into a void. The whole subject is philosophical rather than exegetical. It involves epistemology, and the investigation of the interaction between truth (whatever it may be called - fact, event, objective reality, value, perspective, structure), its literary expression,

b. Midrashim of Famous Men and Our Fathers

Many possible echoes of pious tales about the heroes of Israel have been detected in the two opening chapters of the First Gospel. Are the origins of the Christ deliberately expressed in the idiom used to proclaim the mighty works of Yahweh in Abraham, Jacob, or Moses?

(i) *Abraham.* - The *legenda* about the birth of Abraham, announced by a star devouring four other stars, and causing terror among the courtiers of Nimrod, whose wise men counsel the slaying of the new-born of Terah, are of recent provenance.[1] They are absent from Josephus, and have but the most slim basis in *Biblical Antiquities* 4:11, 15-16; 6:1-18; 23:4-5; 32:1; all of which passages refer to the adult Abraham being saved from burning at the hand of Nimrod. Any influence of an infancy story of Abraham on Matthew 1:18-2:23 may be discounted.[2]

(ii) *Jacob.* - A pre-Christian Passover Haggadah, dealing with the persecution of Jacob by Laban, has been pressed into service as a parallel to Matthew 2. The network of possible relations between this midrash and the

---

and its interpretation and appropriation by the human subject. The foregoing evaluation of the indebtedness of Mt 2:1-12 to the first century scene detects a tangible and living experience at its roots. Any estimate of the "literal" historicity of Mt 2 (i.e., its "factuality" in the narrow sense) is necessarily incomplete and interim; see Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 113-125; Winandy, *Naissance*, 81-87; Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 81-85; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 252-254; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 12-16. See also below, n. 1 on p. 116, and n. 1 on p. 245.

1 C. Perrot ("Récits d'enfance," 486-488) cites as late the sign of the star and the attempt to kill the child. An exposition of the various hypotheses about the contact with midrashim concerning prominent biblical figures is found in da Spinetoli, *Introduzione*, 32-40; Peretto, "Ricerche," 201-209; and works cited in the previous note: Nellessen, pp. 63-73; Zani, pp. 51-69; Sabourin, pp. 242-252; Soares Prabhu, pp. 6-9; Brown, *Messiah*, 543-545.

2 Against M. M. Bourke, "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," *CBQ* 22 (1960) 160-175, 167; A. Vögtle, "Genealogie," 50, 257 (contrast his later *Messias und Gottessohn*, 59-60); Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 75-78. G. Vermes believes that the eleventh century *Sefer ha-Yashar* creates the infancy story of Abraham on the traditional pattern: 1) a miraculous sign; 2) its interpretation; 3) the condemnation to death of the new-born child; 4) the deliverance of the child (cf. his *Scripture and Tradition*, 67-95, esp. pp. 90-95). It is entirely possible that the haggadic infancy story of Moses inspired much of the Abraham legend. Compare Brown, *Messiah*, 543.

pre-baptism cycle has frequently been charted.[1] The direction and motivation of the flight into Egypt and the return, and the correlation of Laban and Herod, may possibly be relevant for Matthew 2. But the targumic identification of Laban with Balaam does not help to explain the role of the virtuous magi. There is no firm evidence for direct contact between the Gospel and the Haggadah.[2] The general similarities underline that the Gospel of the Origins belongs to a mode of theological exposition effective at the time, but is not modelled on any known predecessor.[3]

(iii) *Moses.* - It is certain that some New Testament writers were acquainted with midrashic tales concerning the infant and adult Moses. Acts 7:16 and 22 mention the beauty before God of the new-born Moses, and

---

1 The Haggadah was published, with a commentary, by L. Finkelstein, "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah," *HTR* 31 (1938) 291-317. Among those who associate it with Mt (1-)2 are: D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956) 189-192; "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," *NTS* 5 (1958/59) 174-187; Bourke, "Literary Genus," 168-173; Cave, "Infancy Narrative," 387-390; J. O. Tuñí, "La tipología Israel-Jesús en Mt. 1-2," *EstE* 47 (1972) 361-376; Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 60-65.

2 With Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 69-72; Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn*, 43-53. Their position is criticized in a review by J. Murphy-O'Connor, *RB* 80 (1973) 282-285. On the basis of the literary analysis by C. T. Davis (*JBL* 80 [1971] 404-421), Murphy-O'Connor finds that all the contacts with the Jacob-Laban midrash belong to the pre-Matthean stage (p. 284). This blending of two hypotheses - the borrowing from the midrash and the identification of the Gospel's *Vorlage* - compounds uncertainty. Even if it were conceded that the Haggadah about Jacob and Laban had an influence on the pre-redactional stage of Mt 2, the data are insufficient to consider it the literary model for the Gospel of the Origins. See also the next note, and Brown, *Messiah*, 544-545.

3 Compare M. Gertner ("Midrashim in the New Testament," *JSS* 7 [1962] 292): "It is often more rewarding to uncover the midrashic ground structure of a N.T. work or passage than to find parallels to some of its teachings in Midrash or in other writings of the time." What is important is, to absorb the self-understanding of first century Judaism, its outlook and idiom. That is why midrash was earlier described as a *Hermeneutik*. So many echoes of the midrashim are discernible that reliance on just one or two is restrictive. For instance, no infancy story of Isaac has yet been proposed as an item in the evangelist's library. But *Jub.* 16:13 and 28:15 put the birth both of Isaac and of royal Judah on the Passover, which is also the anniversary of the creation of the world, and the time for its expected renewal (cf. *Bib. Ant.* 23:8, "et novum ostendi seculum," unless this refers to the gift or prophecy bestowed on children born in the seventh month). At Isaac's birth the stars shone brighter, and the world rejoiced (the magi!). See A. Jaubert, *RevScRel* 47 (1973) 383-384.

his later familiarity with Egyptian wisdom (cf. Hebrews 11:23). His clash with Jannes and Jambres (originally the anonymous magicians of Exodus 7:11, who reappear as the two sons of Balaam in *Targum Yerušalmi I* to Numbers 22: 22) is recalled in 2 Timothy 3:8. Many have attempted to show a similar reference in Matthew 1-2.[1] It is almost axiomatic in contemporary exegesis that the extra-biblical infancy stories about Moses influenced the narrative of Matthew's Gospel of the Origins.[2] A few scholars judge the Jesus-Moses theme to be subsidiary,[3] or superimposed at a later stage,[4] or just

---

1 A fundamental study is R. Bloch, "Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la littérature rabbinique," *Cahiers Sioniens* 8 (1954) 210-285, esp. pp. 222-229. Her essay has been slightly reworked and systematized by D. M. Crossan, "Structure and Theology of Mt 1.18-2.23," *CahJos* 16 (1968) 119-135. See also, S. Muñoz Iglesias, "El género literario del Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," *EstBib* 17 (1958) 243-273, esp. pp. 270-273. C. Perrot, "Récits d'enfance," 497-504, 512; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 153-161; Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 51-60; Brown, *Messiah*, 114-116, 194.

2 Nellessen (*Das Kind*, 65 n. 38) cites Str-B 1.88; Erdmann, Grundmann, Hahn, Jeremias, Käsemann, Léon-Dufour, Lohmeyer-Schmauch, Pesch, Riedl, Schelkle, Schlatter, Schniewind, Strecker, Vögtle. To these may be added: H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949) 94-95; Le Déaut, *Nuit pascale*, 300-301 and nn. 131 -132; A. Ibañez Araña, "El Evangelio de la Infancia en Mt. 1-2," *Lumen* 18 (1969) 3-25, 9-12; Hill, *Matthew*, 80-81, 86; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 12, 16, 20-21; and the authors in the preceding note.
Paul Winter ("Jewish Folklore in the Matthaean Birth Story," *HibJ* 53 [1952] 34-42) unconvincingly traces Joseph's dreams and the massacre of the infants to (late) Jewish midrash. The five texts adduced on pp. 36-38 mention the casting into the Nile, and four refer to the waters of Meribah. Yet Winter overlooks that common "kerygma." This Moses-centred teaching finds no echo in the Gospel. His comparison of Miriam's dream in *Bib. Ant.* 9:10 with that of Joseph is either arbitrary or unremarkable (pp. 38-40).

3 According to L. Hartman ("Scriptural Exegesis," 139-140), Mt combines several typologies, therefore too much should not be pressed from any one of them; and the theme of Jesus as the New Moses is kept in the background. Gundry (*Use of OT in Matthew*, 196 n. 1) observes: "That striking parallels can also be drawn to heathen stories suggests the comparative method does not here help us to determine historical origins." A pre-redactional story modelled on a popular legend about the birth and infancy of Moses has been transformed by heavy editing, according to Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 288-293.

4 W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Vol. II. *St. Luke and St. Matthew* (Cambridge, 1957) 123; R. S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel. The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew* (Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1969) 90.

marginal.[1] The extensive investigation by W. D. Davies of a possible Jesus-Moses typology in Matthew comes to a negative conclusion.[2] Its existence in Matthew 1:18-2:23 is highly unlikely.[3]

A review of the proposed parallels between midrashim on the infant Moses and Matthew 1-2 will aid the gauging of the possible role of the former in the shaping of the pre-baptism cycle.[4] The midrashim are recorded in Josephus, *Antiquities* 2, §§205-227 (cf. 234-236); Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 9:1-16; and Philo, the Jerusalem Targum, and later rabbinic writings. They are far from uniform; and parts of a developing tradition which should not be homogenized into a new midrash.[5] It is possible, however, to distinguish three stages: the royal annunciation (RA); the

---

1 R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (2d ed.; München, 1966) 130 n. 12 ("nur am Rande"); Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 238 n. 237 ("The borrowing of contemporary Moses legends . . . might seem to Matthew, as it seems to me, rather a paltry notion"). The commentaries on Matthew by Bonnard, Albright and Mann, and Radermakers, scarcely advert to the Moses haggadoth, apparently deeming them unimportant.

2 *Setting*, 5-93, esp. pp. 34 n. 1, and 78-83; cf. Green, *Matthew*, 18-19.

3 Besides Hummel and Davies in the two previous notes, see Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 163-179 (esp. pp. 165-169), who uses the absence of a Moses typology to support his thesis of the non-Jewish Christian origin of Mt; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (2d ed.; Göttingen, 1966) 51, 54, 147 n. 2, 252; Gaechter, "Magierperikope," 268-281; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 62-63, 91; H. Conzelmann, "Literaturbericht zu den Synoptischen Evangelien," *TRu* 37 (1972) 220-272, 260. The whole notion of typology has become equivocal. The customary equation of type with antitype is being replaced by a more flexible symbolic equivalence among recent writers, e.g., Dahl, "The Atonement," 18; da Spinetoli, "Esegesi e Mariologia," 208; Hanson, *Studies in Paul*, Ch. 12, "The Relation Between the Testaments," pp. 258-278; D. L. Baker, "Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament," *SJT* 29 (1976) 137-157. See also on the archetypal symbol, McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 427-428; and on christocentric interpretation, G. W. Olsen, "Allegory, typology, and symbol: the *sensus spiritalis*. Part I: Definitions and earliest history," *Communio* 4 (1977) 161-179; "Part II: Early church through Origen," 357-384.

4 Tables of comparison between Mt 1-2 and the Moses midrashim are given by Muñoz Iglesias, "Género literario," 271; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 64-65. Similarities between Josephus and Mt 2 are listed by Strecker, *Weg*, 51 n. 5; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 290; Brown, *Messiah*, 114-116.

5 See Perrot, "Récits d'enfance," 504. Precise references to the midrashim are given in works cited in preceding notes, e.g., the articles and studies of R. Bloch, C. Perrot, D. M. Crossan, O. da Spinetoli, and L. Zani. They are omitted here to avoid overloading the text.

paternal annunciation (PA); and the escape of the child.[1] In the midrashim the prediction to the ruler of the birth of the divinely favoured child always occurs first. This RA comprises five elements: a divine sign (e.g., the prophecy by a court scribe of the birth of the Israelite liberator - Josephus; Pharaoh's dream about this interpreted by wise men or courtiers - Targum of Jerusalem);[2] general consternation; consultation with advisers; and a first plan to kill the child, whose failure necessitates another one. The PA consists of Amram's dream (or Miriam's vision, according to Pseudo-Philo), by which he is informed of his child's glorious mission, peril, and survival.[3] After both annunciations the midrashim follow the Exodus narrative about the saving of the infant from the Nile.

At least three major, formal, differences between Matthew 1:18-2:23 and the midrashim may be noted. The RA is always first in the latter, but it follows the PA in the Gospel. As a matter of fact, the PA is in two stages in Matthew (1:20-21 and 2:13), which enclose the RA. Secondly, the Nile-escape common to Exodus and the midrashim is not found in Matthew 2, even

---

1 See Crossan, "Structure and Theology," 122. The RA has five elements (Pharaoh's dream, fear, consultation, explanation, two stage plan), and the PA four (divorce, divine message, remarriage, birth). But this outline seems to be drawn up with an eye on Mt. It omits some of the themes of the early infancy haggadoth, noted by Perrot ("Récits d'enfance," 497 [Moses], and pp. 505-506 [the general pattern]): the misery of humanity or of Israel; the prediction that God will graciously send a saviour; his name and mission; the names and outstanding virtue of his parents, who are sterile or aged; the role of God in his birth is manifested by extraordinary signs, such as a flood of light (not a star), or painless or premature parturition, or great beauty; the great and wise of the world menace the child, but the power and care of God protect him so that he may carry out the divine plan.

2 The incident of Pharaoh's dream is absent from first century sources such as Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and *Tg. Neof.* (if this last is so early). Neither is it found in Mt, although Pharaoh's consultation of his advisers about his dream is often compared to the very different summoning of the Sanhedrin by Herod to answer the magi's question. The sources indicate that this consultation was incorporated into the midrash after the composition of the First Gospel.

3 The non-voluntary divorce and remarriage of Moses' parents is a later development of the haggadah, being first found in *Tg. Yer. I*, *Ex. Rab.* on 1:13, and the *Chronicle of Moses*. It is not referred to by Perrot ("Récits d'enfance"), who concentrates on traditions which may be dated before 100 A.D.
See also p. 87 on the absence of any suspicion of Amram concerning his wife.

though there are reminiscences of the flight of the adult Moses to Midian, and his return at the death of the tyrant (Matthew 2:13, 16, 20-21). Lastly, the dream of Pharaoh found in *Targum Yerušalmi I* (but not in *Targum Neofiti*), and the dream vision of Miriam (Pseudo-Philo, *Mekilta*, *Chronicle of Moses*), have no counterpart in Matthew. To these important disparities of form may be added three evangelical motifs wholly foreign to Exodus and the midrashim: the worthy magi whose initiative permeates Matthew 2:1-18; the condemnation of the king and Jerusalem; and the explicit fulfilment of prophecy. A host of minor differences might be enumerated, e.g., the similarities between the announcements to Herod and to Joseph, and those to Amram, Pharaoh, and Miriam, are few compared with the dissimilarities. Pharaoh does not know where the child is to be found, but Herod does; the escape of Jesus recalls the death of Pharaoh/Herod just as much as it does the flight and return of the forty year old Moses. A husband's uneasiness at the pregnancy of his wife is not found in the Moses legends. But it is crucial to Matthew 1, and features in several other contemporary Jewish writings.[1] There is no indication that Matthew borrowed from these works. What the "parallel" does suggest is, that a birth story cannot be told without awakening echoes. Such echoes have no necessary formative influence on the Gospel story. The same remark applies to the haggadoth regarding the origins of Moses.

Two other possible contacts require to be mentioned. Both Moses in haggadoth and Jesus in Matthew 1 are called saviour. This term is so common in the Old Testament and the targums (e.g., added to Numbers 24:7 by all three versions of the Palestinian Targum; and to Numbers 24:17 by *Targum Yerušalmi II* and *Neofiti I*), that its application to the two leaders is not particularly significant. More striking is the fact that in Exodus 1:15-22 the failure of the midwives to kill the Hebrew infants forces Pharaoh to adopt a second method of counteracting the Israelite population growth. *Targum Yerušalmi I* and later midrashim (but not Josephus) dwell on the virtue of the midwives, which necessitated a second plan. There is a certain parallel in Matthew 2 to this double scheme. The magi, like the

---

1 For Manoah's suspicion of his wife, see Josephus, *Ant.* 5, §§276-284 (cf. *Bib. Ant.* 42:2, 5). Lamech is reassured about the conception of Noah by Enoch in 1QapGen 2:1-2 (compare *1 Enoch* 106-107). Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 399-400.

midwives of old, fail to assist the ruler in tracking down the child of promise, and therefore he has to slay all the infants in a given area. If the Gospel borrowed the drama of the failure of a first plan leading to the formation of a second, it could easily have taken it from Exodus rather than from any haggadah. The midrashic extolling of the virtue of the midwives is absent from the portrayal of the magi, e.g., from Matthew 2:12. Some consider the midrashim provide the explanation of two peculiar points in Matthew 2: the corporate fear of Jerusalem and its king, and the convocation of the Sanhedrin. Both are found in different ways in the varied haggadoth about Pharaoh and his entourage. Yet a closer parallel is the Gospel itself, where they are recognizable as traits congenial to Matthew. Compare the turmoil of the whole city at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem - ἐσείσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις (21:10). The συνάγειν of 2:4 later describes the gatherings of his enemies against Jesus during his Jerusalem ministry and passion - 22:34, 41; 26:3, 57; 27:62; 28:12.[1]

Conclusion. - Many criticisms have been made above of the proposed midrashic parallels to Matthew 1-2. Three final negative remarks will serve as a partial recapitulation of these. There is no verbal allusion to the infancy story of Moses in Exodus 1, although there are phrases reminiscent of the career of the adult Moses in Exodus 2 and 4. Obviously this casts doubt on any deliberate recall of the Pharaonic pogrom in Matthew 2. Secondly, the whole spirit of the haggadoth is more effusive than Matthew's measured sentences, visual poverty, and restrained emotion. They are almost naive in contrast to the Gospel's biblically saturated reflections. Lastly, there is real doubt about the antiquity of some rabbinic traditions.

The midrashic writings about the origins of Moses do not affect Matthew 1 (against R. Bloch, D. M. Crossan, A. Paul, E. Nellessen, L. Zani). It is

---

1 Against Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 67; Zani, *"Abbiamo visto"*, 57-59. G. Erdmann (*Vorgeschichten*, 58) has illustrated how the ruler's fear of his successor is not confined to the midrashim, but is part of the widespread *Thronfolgerlegende* (cf. Gundry's remark in n. 3, p. 84). The hostile συνάγειν may echo Ps 2:2; cf. Acts 4:26-27, and J. C. Fenton, *The Gospel of Saint Matthew* (Harmondsworth, 1963) 46. Nellessen (*Das Kind*, 54-55) notes that both the involvement of all Jerusalem, and the use of συνάγειν, betray the style of the First Gospel (cf. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 284). But he does not draw the obvious conclusion that this fact greatly lessens the likelihood of their being borrowed from midrashim.

the adult Moses who is echoed in Matthew 2:13-20. Exodus 2 and 4 provide expressions for these verses, and not any haggadah on the childhood of a hero of Israel. In the remaining pericope, Matthew 2:1-12, the virtuous magi lack any credible counterpart in the midrashim. Other elements, such as the general alarm and assembly of the leaders of the people, fit Matthew's purpose to perfection, and show no sign of being imported from the haggadoth. The Gospel of the Origins as a whole reflects the Old Testament interest in a great figure's parents, annunciations, the menace that hangs over the royal child, the Queen Mother, revelation in dreams, and the flight into Egypt. Analogies between Matthew 1:18-2:23 and the infant Moses of popular story are sufficiently explained by the common dependence of the Gospel and the haggadoth on the Old Testament. Accounts of holy and wondrous childhoods were in vogue in the first century. This interest probably affected Matthew, or, more precisely, the material he may have worked on. But specific instances of *solely* midrashic influence have not been demonstrated.

A corollary of the foregoing is, that a new Moses or a new Exodus typology is certainly not dominant in these two chapters.[1] The Davidic motif is more explicit, and will be elaborated in Chapters 6 and 7. What is really remarkable in Matthew 1-2 is the thematic richness, the density of evocation which defies confinement to any single typology.

c. The Prophetic Geography of the Holy Land

The second chapter of Matthew reads like a pilgrimage through the Land

---

1 Whereas Paul (*L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 162) speaks of "la toile de fond 'exodique' des récits mathéens de l'enfance de Jésus," J. Coppens (*Messianisme royal*, 151) is more perceptive in saying that the royal messianic hope is "la toile de fond sur laquelle ils [Matthieu et Luc] nous racontent les événements qui ont accompagné la naissance et l'enfance de Jésus ... Chez Matthieu cet arrière-fond est très accusé." Not a single one of the five fulfilment formula quotations gravitates around Moses or the exodus as such. How vague is the reference to the original Mosaic context of allusions in Mt 2 may be gauged by contrast with the extra-biblical comparison of Esdras with Moses in 4 Ezra 14, and of the Qumran Teacher with him - cf. O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumrantexte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr, 1960) 62-64. The centre of gravity has shifted in the Gospel, where the OT is filtered through Jesus Christ. Albright and Mann (*Matthew*, 18) concur: "Matthew's OT quotations see Jesus as living, in himself, through the spiritual experience of a whole people, and not as an individual who becomes another Moses." See also above, n. 3 on p. 85.

of Promise - Bethlehem of Judea, Jerusalem, Ramah, the land of Israel, Judea, Galilee, and Nazareth. "When Israel went forth from Egypt . . . Judah became his sanctuary, Israel his dominion" (Psalm 114:1-2).[1] Even the mighty neighbours, who for good or ill helped shape Israel's experience of Yahweh, and still sheltered those ten banished tribes, are there - the East and Egypt. All these places have known the works of Yahweh, and now they know his Christ. Of the prophetic geography of Bethlehem little need be said, save that the hamlet would evoke the royal Messiah for a people nourished on 1 Samuel 16, Micah 5, and Ruth 4.[2] Despite humble beginnings

---

1 See p. 34 above; Stendahl, "Quis et Unde?," 97-99; also, G. W. Buchanan, *The Consequences of the Covenant* (NovTSup 20; Leiden: Brill, 1970), e.g., pp. 42-90 attempting to show the Kingdom of God is Palestine; W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley, etc., 1974), esp. pp. 221-243, 349-376.

2 Perhaps already in the first century Ruth was read at Pentecost. At that period the feast seems to have been associated with covenant renewal (*Jub.* and Qumran), and, a little later, with the gift of the Torah (rabbinic writings). The gathering of the pilgrims from the Diaspora lent the feast a universalistic tone. See R. Le Déaut, "Pentecost and Jewish Tradition," *DoctrLife* 20 (1970) 250-267 (transl. from *AsSeign* 51 [1963] 22-38); J. P. Charlier, *The Gospel of the Church's Infancy* (De Pere, Wisconsin: St. Norbert Abbey, 1969) 105-113, 119-122.

Probably it is mere coincidence that the προσεκύνησεν of the Gentile Ruth in Bethlehem, before the ancestor of David, Boaz (Ruth 2:10), anticipates the Bethelehem προσεκύνησαν of the magi to the Son of David (Mt 2:11). However, at least three elements could be understood as coalescing into an argument in favour of an evocation of Ruth in Mt 2:1-12. The Pentecost lections may have given a widespread liturgical familiarity with the incorporation of foreigners into Israel at Bethlehem. Secondly, the messianic colouring of Ruth was possibly heightened by an allegorical interpretation; cf. L.-B. Gorgulho, "Ruth et la 'Fille de Sion' mère du Messie," *RevThom* 63 (1963) 501-514, esp. pp. 510-514. Thirdly, Ruth features in Mt's genealogy. Neverthless, the absence of a verbal allusion to Ruth in Mt 2:1-12 renders it unlikely that the Gospel could intend more than a very general reference to this other work connecting Bethlehem with a righteous Gentile and the birth of an heir to David.

That the Messiah was to be born at Bethlehem was not current orthodoxy, see Str-B 1.83 (though cf. 2.488-489); J. Blinzler, "Die Heimat Jesu. Zu einer neuen Hypothese [H. Stegemann]," *BK* 25 (1970) 14-20, 14-15. An actual birth at Bethlehem, far from excluding "heilige Topographie" (E. Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 31), would stimulate contemplation of the divine fidelity to the house of David, and to the royal covenant which was eternal (Ps 89:19-37). The messianic symbolism of the village was still alive, to judge from the forging of a legend about the birth at Bethlehem of Menaḥem ben Hezekiah, the leader of the 66 A.D. revolt, who had messianic pretensions. On this forgery see Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 277.

and the malice of a king, the child of destiny would unite Judah and Israel and give the twelve tribes rest in their own land, the Land of Israel (see 1 Samuel 7:1; 8:14-15; Matthew 2:20-21). Galilee of the Gentiles was the focus of what may be called a mystique. Unfortunately, the hopes elicited by this name can only be guessed at from a multitude of scattered indications. Since at that time the notion of Galilee could extend as far as Damascus,[1] the contemporary Jewish references to that city may have a bearing on Matthew 2:22-23. The references to the migration to, and the new covenant in, the region of Damascus in the Damascus Document include an esoteric exegesis of Amos 5:26-27. The mention of the city in Zechariah 9:1 was taken as foretelling that Damascus would be the place of the *parousia* of the Messiah, the eschatological temple, and the ingathering of the exiles.[2] Second century rabbis extended Jerusalem to Damascus in order to make this interpretation conform to the centralization of Deuteronomy.[3] Therefore, for the first century Jew Galilee need by no means have conjured up the vision of a benighted, desecrated, semi-pagan province.

This very brief survey of contemporary appreciation of Bethlehem and Galilee prepares for the exploration later of Matthew's own prophetic geography.[4]

---

1 The men of Nephthali occupied upper Galilee and the territory eastward μέχρι Δαμασκοῦ, according to *Ant.* 5, §86. On this greater Galilee see also J.-M. van Cangh, "La Galilée dans l'évangile de Marc: un lieu théologique?," *RB* 79 (1972) 59-75, at pp. 72-74.

2 Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 43-49 (with references); Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 163-165.

3 Davies (*Setting*, 296) quotes the rule of Rabbi Akibah: "The like of whatsoever is permitted to be done in the land of Israel may be done also in Syria." Davies adds that this implies much discussion on the relation of Syria to Palestine. Note also his Appendix VII, "Galilean and Judaean Judaism," (pp. 450-451). The question was topical because Damascus had one of the very largest Jewish communities outside Palestine. See Safrai and Stern, *The Jewish People* I/1, pp. 137, 142.

4 P. 103 mentions the series of placenames: Bethlehem in 2:1, 5, 6, 8; Egypt in 2:13-15, 19; Nazareth in 2:23 and 4:13; the wilderness (of Isaiah) in 3:1, 3 and 4:1; and Capernaum in 4:13. Galilee and Nazareth are part of the contempt of the Messiah during the Passion (p. 105). See further on Ramah (pp. 136-139), Galilee (139-142), and Nazareth (pp. 212-215).

P A R T I I

T H E G O S P E L S E T T I N G

O F M A T T H E W 1 - 2

PART II

THE GOSPEL SETTING OF MATTHEW 1 - 2

CHAPTER 4

THE SITUATION OF MATTHEW

In Part One of this book the wider background of Matthew 1-2 was considered: the traditions he may have inherited (Chapter 1); his borrowing from biblical writings (Chapter 2); and the possible contribution of other Jewish literature of the first century (Chapter 3). It remains to evaluate the personal stamp of the writer of the Gospel. This is the task of the four remaining chapters.

The cachet of Matthew, the final literary craftsman, necessarily reveals something of his audience, the situation which he was addressing (Chapter 4). The evangelist writes from faith to faith, from a community to a community. Its circumstances and interests, its opportunities and problems, inevitably colour Matthew's manner and message. Chapter 5 deals with Matthew 1-2 as an integral part of the First Gospel, as sharing its character and contributing to its overall effect. Whereas Part Two concentrates on the relation between the Gospel of the Origins and the rest of Matthew, Part Three focuses on the special contribution of the two opening chapters. This contribution may be duly relished only after appreciating its general religious background (Part One), and its immediate Gospel setting (Part Two).

Regarding Matthew's milieu and outlook, there is one significant piece of evidence outside the Gospel itself. Papias asserted that "Matthew compiled the reports in the Hebrew language (Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια

συνετάξατο), and each one translated (ἡρμήνευσεν, - interpreted?) them as best he could."[1] Unfortunately, what was once considered a firm historical foundation has sunk into the morass of recent criticism. Little can be retained from Papias other than that a Jewish Christian, and probably Aramaic, tradition underlies the First Gospel.

The internal evidence, the testimony of the Gospel itself to Matthew's situation, can be treated only in a synthetical manner.[2] It is widely held that Matthew represents a congregation of Christians which has definitively broken with official Jewry.[3] This opinion is sometimes coupled with the

---

1 In Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16. On this ambiguous passage consult J. Munck, "Presbyters and Disciples of the Lord in Papias," *HTR* 52 (1959) 223-243, 228 (λόγια comprise both sayings and narratives; "Hebrew" is a quality favouring inclusion in the canon); J. Kürzinger, "Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäusevangeliums," *BZ* 4 (1960) 19-38 ("Hebrew" may refer to the style, not the language, i.e., Mt may originally have been written in Greek, and, possibly, later translated into a semitic tongue - pp. 31-35); Strecker, *Weg*, 15-16 (no support for a Jewish Christian origin of Matthew); Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 40-42 (very little can be concluded about the author and origin of Matthew [compare Green, *Matthew*, 44-48; Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, CLXXXIX-CLXXXI]); C. S. Petrie, "The Authorship of 'The Gospel According to Matthew': a Reconsideration of the External Evidence," *NTS* 14 (1967/68) 15-33 (a vigorous defence of the reliability of Papias); E. L. Abel, "Who Wrote Matthew?," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 138-152, 138-140 (Papias meant Q; cf. Hill, *Matthew*, 23-27); D. G. Deeks, "Papias Revisited," *ExpT* 88 (1976/77) 296-301, 324-329 (Papias' Matthew is no known document - pp. 298-299).

2 No multidisciplinary investigation of Matthew's audience and idiom has yet been attempted, which would be comparable to that of Mark by Howard Clark Kee, *Community of the New Age*. A methodology like that of Kee on pp. 9-13 and 77-105 has yet to be applied to Matthew. The complexity of the problem of understanding the social and religious world of the New Testament writings appears in J. Z. Smith, "The Social Description of Early Christianity." In his extensive bibliography the works of J. G. Gager, M. Hengel, W. A. Meeks, and G. Theissen, should be noted. Perhaps the nearest approach to this treatment is found in Eduard Schweizer's collection of essays, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* (Stuttgart, 1974). Some of his ideas are further developed by G. N. Stanton, "5 Ezra and Matthean Christianity in the Second Century," *JTS* 28 (1977) 67-83.

3 E.g., Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, passim; W. Trilling, *Das wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (3rd ed.; München, 1964) 95-96; Strecker, *Weg*, 30-35; D. R. A. Hare, J. Rohde, R. Walker, J. D. Kingsbury, and S. Van Tilborg in D. J. Harrington, "Matthean Studies since Joachim Rohde," *HeyJ* 16 (1975) 375-388, 379-383; E. A. LaVerdiere and W. G. Thompson, "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke," *TS* 37 (1976) 567-597, 576-578 (Thompson).

belief that the author was a Gentile Christian.[1] Supporters of a Matthean church isolated from Jewry explain the Judaistic passages as coming from an earlier tradition, and the universalistic traits as Matthean redaction. But it must be objected that sentiments favouring Jew and Gentile are both found in what appear to be the editor's retouches.[2] Another explanation offered for this coexistence of seemingly contradictory sentiments is, that the period of Jesus knew only a mission limited to Israel, but that the period of the Church saw the mission extended to all nations. This interpretation is more satisfactory, provided it is not hardened into a periodization of history in Matthew after the Lucan model.[3] Also, there are

---

1 So Nepper-Christensen, Trilling, Strecker, Walker, van Tilborg, W. Pesch, Frankemölle, as agreed with by L. Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel As Teacher of the Gentiles. *The Setting of Matthew's Christology*," *Int* 29 (1975) 24-40, 33-34; and J. P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt. 5:17-48* (Rome, 1976) 16-21.

2 Cf. Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 163-166; K. Tagawa, "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 149-162, 152-155; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 373-375; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 359. E. L. Abel ("Who Wrote Matthew?") suggests a two stage "Matthean" redaction - a Jewish Christian followed by a Gentile Christian one. He relies too heavily on arguments from content, which tend to be subjective, and does not explain why the Jewish Christian "contradictions" are not expunged.

3 Such a periodization is advocated in various ways by Strecker, *Weg*, 99-118, cf. pp. 184-188; Davies, *Setting*, 326-333; G. Bornkamm, "The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus," in *The Future of our Religious Past* (ed. J. M. Robinson; translated from *Zeit und Geschichte* [Tübingen, 1964]; New York: Harper and Row, 1971) 203-229; R. Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium* (Göttingen, 1967) 114-118(127). Others, more correctly, prefer to stress the two states of Christ - the earthly Jesus sent to Israel, and the risen Lord sending the disciples to all nations after the inauguration of the last times, e.g., Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 101-103, 137-140; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 122, 136-142, and esp. pp. 168-173; Hill, *Matthew*, 65-66; Green, *Matthew*, 19-20; Meier, *Law and History*, 25-40. A salvation history in (three) clearly defined stages is rightly opposed by Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 168-172; P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: University Press, 1969) 192; and compare K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (2nd ed.; Lund, n.d. [1968]) viii n. 3; Tagawa, "People and Community," 157; J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia, 1975) 25-37.
That a Lucan time reckoning is not found in Matthew is also indicated by the failure of its proponents to delimit its supposed stages. See the indecision of Strecker, *Weg*, 117. Of course this is not to deny that Matthew distinguished past, present, and future. Note the analysis of W. G. Thompson, "An Historical Perspective in the Gospel of Matthew," *JBL* 93 (1974) 243-262.

some instances of Jesus helping believing pagans which should not be brushed aside.[1] Again, the placing of Jew and Gentile on different planes of salvation history is hardly consonant with the author's continuing preoccupation with Judaism. His concern with prophecy and the abiding value of the Law,[2] his lively criticism of the Pharisees,[3] and his refusal to consider the Jews as wholly rejected,[4] all point to a Christian community

---

1 Both Trilling (*Das wahre Israel*, 104-105, 137-138) and Strecker (*Weg*, 117) minimize the significance of the fact that the centurion of Mt 8:5-13 and the Canaanite woman of 15:21-28 are heathen. Note also the Syrians cured in 4:24, and the presumably pagan Gadarenes of 8:28-34. The Messiah of Israel comes into contact with Gentiles, who are admitted to the Israel of Matthew. See further: C. H. Giblin, "Theological Perspective and Matthew 10:23b," *TS* 29 (1968) 637-661; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 339-344, 380; R. Thysman, *Communauté et directives éthiques. La catéchèse de Matthieu* (Gembloux, 1974) 12-17.

2 Matthew's evaluation of the Torah as prophetic and (re-)focused in the Messiah is brought out well by Meier, *Law and History*, 79-89, 119, 166-169. He profits from the earlier works by G. Barth, R. Hummel, R. S. McConnell, R. A. Guelich, E. Schweizer, A. Sand, and R. Banks. See also Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, CVI-CXV; Thysman, *Communauté*, 36-44; P. F. Ellis, *Matthew: his Mind and his Message* (Collegeville, 1974) 138-155.

3 Probably the opponents of Jesus castigated by Matthew are projections of those hostile to the evangelist's audience; cf. Davies, *Setting*, 256-315 (however, his suggestion of a post-Jamnia situation he wisely terms, "not a leap into the dark, but into the twilight of available sources" [315]); Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 12-20; D. R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Cambridge, 1967) 81-96; Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 188; Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 121 (too categoric an assertion of the view of W. D. Davies); cf. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 13-15. Matthew represents the enemies of Jesus as presenting a united front. But R. Walker (*Heilsgeschichte*, 11-35) exaggerates in deducing from this that Matthew had no contact with Jewry, and was even misinformed about it (compare Meier, *Law and History*, 18-19). See the criticism of Walker by J. D. Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13* (London, 1969) 140.

4 Those who favour a Gentile Christian character for the First Gospel stress the rejection of "Israel," e.g., Strecker, *Weg*, 35; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 95; Hare, *Jewish Persecution*, 127, 164-165, 170 (where, despite his conviction that Matthew was himself a Jew, he speaks of the "unrelieved pessimism" of the Gospel concerning the conversion of the Jews); Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, passim; Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel," 25-26, 32-33. The position is not so clearcut. P. Richardson (*Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 189) expresses the ambivalence well: "The Christian community is no longer tied to the institutions of Israel, but it shies away from making the rupture complete by transposing titles or by working through the gospel on basis of a remnant idea." Compare Meier, *Law and Gospel*, 13.

in touch with first century Judaism. That Matthew's community is actually a member of the league of synagogues seems excluded by the critical attitude adopted towards Pharisaism.[1]

Matthew is able to say what the ἐκκλησία (16:18; 18:17) is not - Pharisaic Judaism. But he has very great difficulty in expressing positively what it is. The Church is not explicitly the true Israel, still less a *tertium genus*. The self-awareness of Matthew's circle comes to speech in 21:43: "I tell you [chief priests and scribes, v. 15], the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation (ἔθνει) producing the fruits of it." This ἔθνος, or people, is not the Gentiles (ἔθνοι), but the "holy people" of 1 Peter 2:9, the obedient Israel of Matthew drawn from Jew and Gentile, a regrouping of Israel around its Messiah.[2] The community of Matthew has not yet severed all contact with unbelieving Judaism, and apparently is not without hope for its conversion.[3]

In the light of the foregoing a number of assertions may be made with some measure of confidence. Matthew was a Christian with a Jewish background, almost certainly a Jew (midrashic style, major role of the Torah and the prophets, concern for unbelieving Jews). His community was Greek-speaking, and open to the opportunities and temptations outside strictly

---

1 Against G. Bornkamm in Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (London, 1963) 26; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 28-33. See also n. 3 below.

2 See further in this sense, R. J. Dillon, "Towards a Tradition-History of the Parables of the True Israel (Matthew 21,33 - 22,14)," *Bib* 47 (1966) 1-42, 20-21, 34-35; H. Frankemölle, "Amtskritik im Matthäus-Evangelium?," *Bib* 54 (1973) 247-262, 252-254; J. P. Meier, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102. K. Tagawa ("People and Community," 162) speaks helpfully of Matthew's "undifferentiated community consciousness," meaning his reluctance or inability to distinguish between the Church and Israel. He is followed by Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 372-375. Compare: "l'évangéliste ne souhaite pas tracer une ligne de démarcation entre judaïsme et christianisme," E. Trocmé, "Le christianisme primitif, un mythe historique?," *ETR* 49 (1974) 15-29, 24; Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 54, 117-120. But note K. Berger, "Volksversammlung und Gemeinde Gottes. Zu den Anfängen der christlichen Verwendung von 'ekklesia'," *ZTK* 73 (1976) 167-207, 198-201.

3 Cf. Stendahl, *School*, xi-xii; Tagawa, "People and Community," 158-162; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 72-76, 134; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 347-348, 396-397; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (revised ed.; London, 1975) 81-83; Green, *Matthew*, 30-31; Cope, *A Scribe Trained*, 126-127; Meier, *Law and History*, 13.

traditional Jewish Christianity[1] (good Greek and use of Septuagint, interest in ethics rather than inherited regulations, disagreement about the importance of the Law[2]). It was independent of organized Jewry, but apparently in debate with it. The Gospel's frank universalism bespeaks a church with a significant number of Gentile adherents.[3] If a place of origin has to be proposed, Syria is the most likely - and not necessarily Antioch. South western Syria, or greater Galilee, is equally plausible.[4]

---

1 On this term see B. J. Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Towards a hypothetical Definition," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 46-57; Stanton, "5 Ezra and Matthean Christianity," 68 n. 2. The Hellenization of Palestine in the first Christian century has been illustrated by the studies of such scholars as S. Lieberman, V. Tcherikover, M. Smith, and M. Hengel. Therefore, Matthew's use of the Septuagint and openness to Gentile converts does not of itself exclude a Palestinian provenance of the Gospel. Note, however, the judicious observations of Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 294-295 n. 2.

2 Matthew does not seem to be confronting an ideological antinomianism, but rather the carelessness and over-optimism of what may be termed progressive and active disciples. See E. Schweizer, "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew," *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 213-230; J. P. Martin, "The Church in Matthew," *Int* 29 (1975) 41-56, 45-46; Meier, *Law and History*, 168; D. Hill, "False Prophets and Charismatics: Structure and Interpretation in Matthew 7,15-23," *Bib* 57 (1976) 327-348, 333-340. For a convenient presentation of a somewhat different point of view, see Kingsbury, *Parables*, 161 n. 67.

3 By and large the foregoing understanding of Matthew's milieu corresponds with the estimation of exegetes cited, such as Stendahl, Kingsbury, Schweizer, Kümmel, Thysman, Cope, and Green. Compare Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 43-44; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 7-8; Thompson, "New Testament Communities," 571-574. But see following note.

4 The area around Damascus had strong and early Jewish and Christian settlement, and Galilee could be considered to extend as far as that city (nn. 1 and 3 on p. 91). The church of south western Syria was in a fairly cosmopolitan environment (the Decapolis), a fact which could account for the blend of Greek and Palestinian influences in the Gospel.
Less relevant are the questions of the date of Matthew, and of its presumed dependence on Mark. Matthew was probably composed prior to the amorphous Jamnia. It may even be asked if the vast majority of scholars who place Matthew after 70 A.D. have any irrefutable argument in their favour; cf. J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1976) 97-107. Secondly, the Synoptic problem is in the melting pot, and this work avoids the hypothesis that Matthew edits, or closely follows, Mark. Note the (minority) opinion of W. R. Farmer, "Modern Developments of Griesbach's Hypothesis," *NTS* 23 (1976/77) 275-295, with the reference to B. Orchard on p. 283; and of J. M. Rist, *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark* (SNTSMS 32; Cambridge: University Press, 1978).

CHAPTER 5

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MATTHEW 1-2 WITH THE REST OF THE GOSPEL

A. THE STRUCTURE OF THE FIRST GOSPEL

1) *Has Matthew an Overall Plan?*

This question has exercised the ingenuity of numerous investigators.[1] Many leads have been followed in the effort to detect a master plan of the evangelist: his similarity to, and divergences from, Mark; his use of rhetorical formulas and concentric development (C. H. Lohr, P. Gaechter, P. F. Ellis); his topography (see W. Trilling); his possible echoes of the Pentateuch (P. Rolland); his correspondence to a liturgical calendar (M. D. Goulder); or a combination of literary and theological observations interpreted as showing a gradual penetration of the mystery of the Messiah (J. Radermakers, J. D. Kingsbury, L. Ramaroson, L. Sabourin, D. L. Barr).

None of these proposals is entirely convincing. The problem of Matthew's composition remains to be solved. Consequently, the First Gospel's two opening chapters cannot be analyzed as systematically contributing to a grand design.

---

1 There is no need to review the numberless studies on the structure of Matthew, since that has been done by, among others, W. G. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community. Mt. 17,22 - 18,35* (AnBib 44; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970) 13-16; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 14-22; Harrington, "Matthean Studies," 376-379; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 1-39 (with a wide-ranging review of earlier studies on pp. 2-4); Sabourin, *Matteo*, 48-64; D. L. Barr, "The drama of Matthew's Gospel: a reconsideration of its structure and purpose," *TD* 24 (1976) 349-359.
If the Gospels are accepted as "dramatic history" (Roland Mushat Frye), the isolation of an abstract (theo-)logical structure is of little importance. Matthew's story is like a drama on stage. As W. G. Thompson ("New Testament Communities," 574 n. 16) writes: "The action is the narrative itself, the Evangelist is the playwright-director off-stage, and the community is the audience. Matthew speaks to his community, like the playwright-director, through the action in the narrative."

2) *Matthew 1-2 as a Literary Unit*

The evangelist has given his two opening chapters a formal unity by means of hookwords, inclusions, and what may be called a triple beat. Matthew 1:1 introduces three elements which dominate the whole chapter: "The book of the origin of Jesus [the] Christ." The first paragraph is rounded off by "Jesus . . . who is called Christ" in verse 16. The seventeenth verse is a summarizing comment on 1:1-16, and serves as a coda dividing the passage from what follows. The concentric symmetry of the genealogy is manifest: A B C (1:1); C' B' A' (1:2-16); C B A (1:17).

The second paragraph opens with "Jesus [the] Christ" as an emphatic link with the genealogy.[1] The γένεσις of 1:1 recurs in 1:18; and the γεννηθέν of 1:20 echoes the mysterious passive ἐγεννήθη in 1:16, which clashes with the preceding thirty-nine instances of the active ἐγέννησεν. Lastly, the key word "Jesus" (1:1, 16, 18,-21)includes both the pericope and the whole first chapter in its climactic final position in 1:25. Matthew 1:18-25 is thus firmly connected with 1:1-17, and constitutes an immediate elucidation of "the genesis of this Jesus Christ" (1:18a). As has

---

1 Mt 1:18a is best translated, "The genesis of this Jesus (the) Messiah." Radermakers (*Matthieu*, 34) renders the emphasis well: "Or de Jésus, Christ, ainsi fut la genèse" (cf. *Texte*, 9). Vaticanus and Freerianus margin produce an even better text by inversion: "Now the genesis of the Christ, Jesus, took place in this way." Commentators on Mt usually delete "Jesus," mainly on the strength of the Syriac sinaiticus and curetonianus; cf. R. Pesch, *Bib* 48 (1967) 409 n. 2. The critical editions of Legge and Nestle retain both "Jesus" and "Christ," a combination very rare in the Gospels. The comprehensive study of R. C. Nevius (*The Divine Names in the Gospels* [SD 30; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1967]) concludes, against the majority of exegetes, that the reading Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is not original. He inclines to accept "Jesus" alone (p. 56). Nevertheless, the context requires the retention of both. The structure at 1:18 demands emphatic linkwords with 1:1-16 after the break at v. 17. Compare the renewed mention of Egypt and the death of Herod in 2:19, which harks back to v. 15 after the interruption of 2:16-18. The message of 1:18-25 suggests the introduction of "Jesus" at the outset (see vv. 21b and 25c). "Christ" at the end of v. 17 makes the word's repetition in 1:18 more credible; and the Davidic slant of 1:20-25 makes it even more probable that "Christ" stood with "Jesus" in 1:18 from the start. An exegete whose work preceded the New Criticism noted several factors inclining towards the acceptance of "Jesus Christ" in v. 18. But he interpreted them in exactly the opposite sense, due to lack of appreciation of their structural role, and of the theological importance of names; see M'Neile, *Matthew*, 6. On the correlation between the textual problem and exegesis see Stendahl, "Quis et Unde?," 101 n. 34; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 177.

been observed by Krister Stendahl, this passage is "the enlarged footnote to the crucial point in the genealogy [ἐγεννήθη in 1:16b]."[1]

If the first chapter forms quite a closely knit whole, the second chapter also has a certain cohesion. It does not seem to have been remarked before that Matthew 2 is framed by 2:1 and 3:1, which have three terms in common: τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἐν ἡμέραις, and παραγίνομαι (a verb occurring in Matthew only here and in 3:13). This emphatic inclusion stamps the chapter as a unit. This impression is strengthened by the inclusion between 2:12 and 2:22: χρηματίζειν κατ'ὄναρ . . . ἀναχώρειν. Not only are the two halves of Matthew 2 aligned by their parallel endings, but they are linked by the chiasm at 2:12-13: κατ'ὄναρ . . . ἀνεχώρησαν | ἀναχωρησάντων . . . κατ'ὄναρ. Another literary factor contributing to the impression that Matthew 2 is a unit is the use of καλέω as the final word in 1:25 and 2:23.

Yet the two opening chapters belong together. They are connected by that literary Janus 1:18-25, which looks backward to the genealogy and forward to Matthew 2.[2] Unlike the roll call of the ancestors of the Messiah, 1:18-25 anticipates the narrative of the subsequent pericopes. However, the resonance of the messianic family tree might function almost as a narrative for the audience of the Gospel. More important links with Matthew 2 are the five prophetic quotations, four of which have the distinctive introductory formula of fulfilment (1:21; 2:15, 17, 23). They serve as centres of gravity, as still points of reflection. Interestingly, these four fulfilment formulas have τὸ ῥηθέν, which distinguishes them, and therewith the opening pair of chapters, from the next quotation which is introduced by ὁ ῥηθείς (3:3). Other elements orientating this bridge passage towards Matthew 2 are the dream narrative about Joseph, and the mention of "his (messianic) people" in 1:21 and 23. Nevertheless, this hinge

---

1 "Quis et Unde?," 100-102. This interpretation is adopted by many, e.g., Vögtle, "Genealogie," 242 n. 53; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 66; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 43-44; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 203.
However, it should be pointed out that 1:16 is itself dependent on the sort of tradition about the divine and Davidic origin of Jesus, which is at the root of 1:18-25. Compare Pesch, "Ausführungsformel," 84; and the association of 1:18 with 1:1, after "the 'digression' of the Genealogy," by Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 179 (but see p. 237).

2 On *Doppelfonktionen* see P. Gaechter, *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium* (SBS 7; Stuttgart: KBW, n.d. [1965?]) 54-59; F. Neirynck, "La rédaction matthéenne et la structure du premier Évangile," *ETL* 43 (1967) 41-73, 56-58.

pericope is structurally attached to the foregoing genealogy as to the jamb of the portal of the Gospel.

The striking differences between Matthew 1 and 2 regarding names, vocabulary, and literary pattern, indicate that these chapters retain a certain independence. The name of the Saviour "Jesus" bestrides the first chapter - verses 1, 16, 18, 21, 25. But it fades from the scene in 2:1, leaving the action to Herod in 2:1, 3, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 22. Secondly, there are contrasts in vocabulary. Matthew 1:18-25 has γυνὴ twice and υἱός thrice, but Matthew 2 uses τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ five times. Whereas personal names are remarkable in the opening chapter, journeys and placenames characterize Matthew 2: ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, παρεγένοντο, ἀναχωρέω (verses 12, 13, 22), ἐπορεύθησαν, Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Land of Judah, Egypt, Ramah, Land of Israel, Galilee, Nazareth. Thirdly, there are several disparities between the revelation schema, the fulfilment formula quotation, and the obedience formula of Matthew 1:18-25, and the Joseph scenes of Matthew 2. The aorist ἐφάνη is found in 1:20, but the historic present φαίνεται in 2:13 and 19.[1] Isaiah 7:14 saturates Matthew 1:18-25 in a manner quite other than the climactic final quotations of 2:15 and 2:23. Lastly, the full obedience formula of 1:24-25, with its ἐποίησεν ὡς προσέταξεν ὁ ἄγγελος, is absent from the corresponding Joseph episodes in the second chapter. In sum, the disparity of names, vocabulary, and schemata dissociates the first chapter, and especially 1:18-25, from the second.

Commentators have noted how Matthew 1 presents the paradox of the person of the Messiah, and the second chapter that of his work.[2] The first chapter establishes the Davidic and divine genesis of Jesus the Christ, the Saviour-Messiah.[3] The following chapter inaugurates his career and reception.

---

1 Rather than being a "pointless difference" (Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 240), the historic present probably serves as an introduction; cf. W. Schenk, "Das Präsens Historicum als Makrosyntaktisches Gliederungssignal im Matthäusevangelium," *NTS* 22 (1975/76) 464-475, 466.

2 See Stendahl, Milton, and Vögtle in Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 11-12. Add Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 30, 39. For a review of opinions on the structure of Mt 1-2 see Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 25-26.

3 In the fine phrase of da Spinetoli, *Introduzione*, 28: "La generazione paterna si chiude con la presentazione di Gesù Cristo (1,16), la generazione propria con la presentazione di Gesù Salvatore (1,25)."

Lastly, since Matthew shows a predilection for the number three,[1] it is not surprising that the rhythm of his first two chapters has a triple beat. This is clearly heard in the genealogy, and in the episodes of 2:13-23. After the introductory unit, 1:18-19, there are two clear caesurae: 1:20, the genitive absolute followed by the revelation schema; and 1:24, the aorist participle introducing the obedience formula. Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν (1:22) introduces the prophetic gloss (1:23), and does not really interrupt the flow of the text. These two verses actually recapitulate the foregoing; and verse 22 places the following question in equilibrium with the previous command of the angel in 1:20-21. Therefore, 1:20-23 coalesce to form the theologically rich centre of gravity, and a triadic structure emerges: Situation (1:18-19); Interpretation (1:20-23); Consequence (1:24-25).

A pair of triads is easily discerned in 2:1-12. The Jerusalem events are framed by the arrival and departure of the magi, 2:1 and 9a. They are three in number: 2:1-2, the magi consult Herod; 2:3-6, an aorist participle (ἀκούσας δὲ) introduces Herod's consternation and consultation; 2:7-9a, another aorist participle (Τότε . . . καλέσας) marks the main caesura at the very centre of the narrative (2:7), and the story is orientated towards Bethlehem, whither Herod sent the magi. After the introductory καὶ ἰδοὺ, the second triad (2:9b-12) continues and concludes the thrust towards Bethlehem. Despite the cohesion given to the narrative by the parataxis of verses 10-12, it is scarcely arbitrary to distinguish another three events: 2:9-10, the journey to Bethlehem; 2:11, the homage of the magi in Bethlehem; 2:12, their return by another way to their place of origin. Both triads, therefore, are structured by a journey, an arrival, and a departure.

The triple beat permeating Matthew 1-2 is also audible in the three similarly constructed Joseph stories, the threefold obedience of 1:24-25 (παρέλαβεν, οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν, ἐκάλεσεν), and the three pairs of solemn verbs and participles in the climactic adoration of 2:11. Thus, the regular and multiform recurrence of triads produces an organic rhythm that blends the two chapters.

---

1 Thirty-eight instances are enumerated by A. Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew* (London, 1909) xix-xxi. See also Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 212-213. Unconvincing is J. Racette, "L'évangile de l'enfance selon saint Matthieu," *ScE* 9 (1957) 77-82.

3) *The Immediate Context: Matthew 1:1-4:17*

Because John the Baptist bursts upon the scene in 3:1 after a vague time reference (compare Exodus 2:11), it is all too easy to presume that the two opening chapters constitute a free-standing section of the Gospel. Such a conclusion is premature. Although no overall plan in Matthew can be proposed as highly probable, it is undeniable that there is a deliberate alternation of narrative and discourse. The first four chapters are quite clearly the presentation in story form of the origins of the person and ministry of Jesus the Christ. The ministry proper is summed up in 4:17, and begins in the following verse. Therefore, Matthew 1:1-4:17 should be considered a unit, and is increasingly being recognized as such.[1]

This passage is also remarkable for its emphasis on the activity of the Holy Spirit (1:18, 20; 3:11, 16; 4:1), and the unparalleled series of six prophetic quotations with geographical interest (2:6, 15, 18, 23; 3:3; 4:15). Finally, the inclusion between 2:22-3:3 and 4:12-17 is unmistakable. There is the word for word repetition of ἀκούσας δὲ . . . ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς (τὰ μέρη τῆς) Γαλιλαίαν (Γαλιλαίας) . . . ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν in 2:22-23 and 4:12-13. Nazareth and the fulfilment formula are also found in each; and the kerygma of Jesus in 4:17 is exactly the same as that of the Baptist in 3:2. Therefore, Matthew 1:1-4:17 acquires an evident cohesion from its narrative mode, literary structure, and what may be called its christophanic content.[2]

---

1 This point is strongly argued by Kingsbury (*Matthew: Structure*, 11-17), who cites E. Krentz, "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue," *JBL* 83 (1964) 409-414. Others who favour this view include J. M. Gibbs, "Mark 1,1-15, Matthew 1,1-4,16, Luke 1,1-4,30, and John 1,1-51. The Gospel Prologues and their Function," *SE* VI (Berlin, 1973) 154-188, 160-165, 178-181; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 20-21, 48; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 6, "Das Werden Jesu"; L. Ramaroson, "La structure du premier évangile," *ScEs* 26 (1974) 69-112, 76-83 (Mt 1:1-4:11 is a double prologue); Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 12; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 51-56.

2 A comparison of the opening passages of the four Gospels has led some to suggest that they follow the same basic plan, e.g., O. J. F. Seitz, "Gospel Prologues: A Common Pattern?," *JBL* 83 (1964) 262-268; Gibbs, "The Gospel Prologues," esp. p. 164. This is not at all likely. Given the Jewish and historical matrix of Jesus, the Gospels are almost compelled to begin with references to the fulfilment of Scripture, the activity of the Spirit, the divine sonship of the Christ, and John his precursor. What does deserve further examination is the presence of the cross and vindication of the Messiah from the very outset. This is the subject of the following sub-section.

4) *The Correspondence between Matthew 1-2 and Matthew 26-28*

Supporters of a chiastic or concentric structure of the First Gospel search for parallels between the opening and closing chapters.[1] If Matthew intended such a correspondence between chapters 1-2 and 26-28, it is reasonable to expect contacts in vocabulary. For the sake of clarity, the two opening chapters may be compared first with the Passion (Matthew 26-27) and then with the final chapter 28.

a. Matthew 1-2 in Relation to 26-27

Possible contacts may be grouped under the headings: christology, geography, and other themes. The phrase in the genealogy, "Jesus who is called (the) Christ" (1:16) recurs only in the mouth of Pilate in 27:17 and 22. Just as in 2:4 the pagan appellation "King of the Jews" (used by the magi in 2:2) was replaced by the Jewish "Christ", so in the Passion the Jerusalem leaders taunt the "Christ" and the "King of Israel" in 26:68*M* and 27:42.[2] The divine sonship of Jesus is expressed indirectly in 1:22-23 and

---

1 Some merely connect Mt 1-2 and 28, e.g., Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 91-92, 149-150, 166-167, 174; B. J. Malina, "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. xxviii.16-20," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 87-103, 99-101; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 321-325. Others extend the association to Mt 26-28, viz., H. B. Green, "The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel," *SE* IV (Berlin, 1968) 47-59, 57-58. Many find parallels between Mt 1-4 and 26-28, including, Fenton, *Matthew*, 16; C. H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 403-435, 410, 413, 427-428; Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 12-13; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Structure of Matthew XIV-XVII," *RB* 82 (1975) 360-384, 370 n. 33. Many of these studies rely more on subjective analogies of content than on vocabulary parallels. Granted Matthew's love of repetition (graphically presented by Barr, "Drama of Matthew's Gospel," 354-355), similarities are to be expected between any lengthy portions of his Gospel; cf. B. Przybylski ("The Role of Mt 3:13-4:11 in the Structure and Theology of the Gospel of Matthew," *BTB* 4 [1974] 222-235): "The first temptation foreshadows the two feeding narratives; the second temptation and baptism foreshadow the transfiguration event; the third temptation foreshadows the conclusion of the Gospel (i.e. Mt 28:16-20)" (p. 225).

2 All three Synoptics show Jesus accused of claiming to be the Christ and the Son of God. On the cross he is taunted as the Christ, according to Mk and Lk. But Mt, true to his interests (1:22-23; 2:15; 14:33; 16:16 - all *M*), has him mocked as the Son of God in 27:39 and 43 (both *M*). It is probably respect for the *paradosis*, as well as his prophetic understanding of the King Messiah, which prompts him to insert "Christ" into the earlier mocking immediately after the Jewish hearing - 26:68*M*.
Both titles imply "Son of David," which does not feature overtly in Mt 26-28. But it is to the fore in 21:9, 15-16 at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, a scene reminiscent of Mt 2 and portending the Passion.

2:15, and explicitly in 14:33*M* and 16:16*M*. In Matthew alone is this sonship turned into a source of raillery in 27:39 and 43. Thus, three titles of Jesus in Matthew 1-2 are used again by the evangelist in 26-27 to show his rejection by "the chief priests, with the scribes and elders."[1] With "King of the Jews/Israel" he shares the Synoptic tradition, but he adds special emphasis to "Christ" and "Son (of God)." It is probable, therefore that in the opening chapters Matthew deliberately anticipates the rejection in chapters 26-27 of the Christ, the (Davidic) King and Son of God.

In Matthew 2 Jerusalem sought to kill the Christ, and he found refuge in Galilee, and became a Nazarene. In Matthew 27 Jerusalem succeeds in killing him, and he goes before the disciples into Galilee as he had said he would (26:32; 28:7). There they see him in triumph, 28:10, 16-17. His home town of Nazareth, and the soubriquet "Nazarene" he received from it in 2:23, recur only during the Jerusalem confrontation and Passion (21:11; 26:69*vl* and 71). (Matthew 4:13 has Ναζαρὰ, not Ναζαρέθ). Like the titles, the pattern of the placenames marks the opening and closing chapters.

There are other possible parallels between the beginning and ending of the Gospel which cannot be reduced to a single category. The δίκαιος and κατ'ὄναρ of the dream of Pilate's wife about the just man (27:19) furnish a reminiscence of 1:19-20, but the content of each scene is quite different.

---

1 The occurrence of this trio in 27:41 is a significant witness to Matthew's respect for the will of God and the word of Jesus. His own phrase for the Jerusalem authorities is, "the chief priests and elders (of the people)," e.g., 21:23; 26:3, 47; 27:1, 3, 12, 20; 28:11-12 - all redactional. Mt has the mind and method of a scribe, and exonerates them whenever he can; cf. Kingsbury, *Parables*, 126 (with references in n. 149); Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 13-15. Why does he here (unlike Mk or Lk) portray the scribes as abusing the crucified Christ? The obvious answer is that he is faithful to the sole other reference to the trio in his Gospel - 16:21. This is the first prediction of the Passion, which is embedded in the common Synoptic tradition: "From that time Jesus (Christ) began to show his disciples that he must (δεῖ) go to Jerusalem and suffer many things from the elders and chief priests *and scribes*, and be killed". (The same three classes appear in Mk 8:31 and Lk 9:22). The ever obedient Matthew takes to heart that the divine plan (δεῖ) must be carried out on Calvary, and must be shown to be fulfilled. Therefore, he, and he alone, expressly states in 27:41 that Jesus suffered many things from "the chief priests, with the scribes and elders." The deliberate correspondence of 27:41 to 16:21 is a discreet sign of his pervading sense of utter submission to the word of God, and of Jesus. Confirmation of the importance of 16:21 is found in the use of ἀπὸ τότε (elsewhere only in 4:17 and 26:16), and of Jesus Χριστός (with Nestle; cf. p. 99, n. 1).

The saving from sins effected by Jesus according to 1:21 and 26:68*M* seems to be a deliberate echo, given the evangelist's care to deny the remitting effect of John's baptism in 3:2. All versions of the Septuagint Jeremiah 38:15 have υἱοί, but Matthew's application of it in 2:18 to the slaughtered infants of Bethlehem has τέκνα. Whether or not this is a redactional alteration, it seems to be a designate counterpart to 27:25, "His blood be on us and on our τέκνα." The tragedy of unbelief affects many in Israel.[1] This hostility is also conveyed by the "chief priests and scribes" who are convoked by Herod in 2:4, and are found again as enemies of Jesus in passages which imply the need of rightly understanding the scriptures (20:18 [cf. 16:23 as a comment on 16:21]; 21:15-16). This malevolent convocation (συνάγω) in 2:4 is conveyed by a verb found twice as often in Matthew (24×) as in Mark (5×) and Luke (6×) combined. In Matthew 3-25 the verb is employed with a variety of implications, but in 26-28 it again has a univocally sinister meaning in the redactional verses 26:3 and 67; 27:62; 28:12 (all referring, as in 2:4, to the Jerusalem leaders); 27:17 (authorities and people); 27:27 (Pilate's cohort). The similarities between Matthew 1-2 and 26-27 adduced in this paragraph add up to the common theme of the atoning martyrdom of the righteous (Davidic) King by unbelieving Jerusalem.

Other contacts in vocabulary between these sections of the First Gospel are instances of the normal redactional repetition of favourite terms, which lend the work consistency and character.[2] There may be a certain quiet irony about the use of ἡγεμών of the Christ in 2:6 and later seven times for Pilate in 27-28; and also of σῴζω in 1:21 and 27:40, 42, 49, as well as of ἐμπαίζω in 2:16 and 27:29, 39, 41, since in the opening chapters these two words express the success of the Christ, but in chapter 27 his rejection. Some frequent terms of Matthew 1-2 are either wholly lacking or without significance in 26-28, e.g., ἐγερθείς, ἔρχομαι, καλέω, παραλαμβάνω, φαίνω, χρηματίζω.

---

1 Goulder, (*Midrash and Lection*, 240 n. 40) misses the theological point. But see Green, "Structure of Mt," 57-58; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 64-65. Note also Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 254-256 and 300. See further on p. 138.

2 For example, ζητέω in 2:13, 20 and thrice in 26-28; λεγόμενος in 1:16 and 2:23 and eight times in 26-27; ἀναχωρέω which occurs four times in Mt 2 and in 27:5; σφόδρα in 2:10 and in 26:22 and 27:54.

b. Matthew 1-2 in Relation to 28

There is certainly a striking structural parallel between the interweaving of the three Joseph, child, and mother stories with the two Herod stories (2:1-12 and 16-18) in 1:18-2:23, and the five scenes of the burial and resurrection narrative, which are arranged chiastically with the help of the two pericopes about the guard on the tomb, in 27:57-28:20.[1] Each of these passages framing the Gospel is concerned with the effects of the Messiah on his disciples and on his enemies - at his birth in Bethlehem and at his birth from the Jerusalem tomb. Each narrative shows the Judean[2] authorities' blindness to the will of God. This will is expressed by scripture in 2:5-6, and by Jesus' interpretation of scripture (the sign of Jonah) in 27:62-64. Only his disciples could understand that "he has risen, *as he said*" (28:6).[3]

There are at least two other significant connections between the final chapter and Matthew 1-2. The presence of Jesus to his disciples in 28:20 recalls the Emmanuel, the saving presence of God in Jesus, of 1:23. The angel of the Lord and the instruction to go to Galilee are found in 2:19, 22 and in 28:2, 7, 10, 17. However, the angel is now decked in apocalyptic garb, and no longer appears in a dream. Another constellation of words speaks of the going before (whether of the star or of Jesus), and of the worship and joy of believers (whether in Bethlehem or Galilee) who behold Jesus: προάγω, προσκυνέω, χαρά μεγάλη, ἰδόντες.[4] The recurrence of these

---

1 The comparison between these opening and closing sections is well developed by Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 173-176. The chiastic divisions are: 1:18-25 / 2:1-12 / 2:13-15 / 2:16-18 / 2:19-23; and 27:57-61 / 27:62-66 / 28:1-10 / 28:11-15 / 28:16-20. See also p. 130 with n. 3.

2 Mt 28:15 is the sole occasion that the evangelist himself speaks of the Ἰουδαῖοι. Very possibly the term should be understood in its most literal sense as "the Judeans." See also M. Lowe, "Who Were the IOYΔAIOI?," *NovT* 18 (1976) 101-130, e.g. pp. 118-119.

3 Further in C. H. Giblin, "Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii.57-xxviii.20)," *NTS* 21 (1974/75) 406-420, esp. pp. 406-408, 414-420.

4 Many of the verbal parallels between Mt 1-2 and 28 are noticed by Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 322-333. He adds the "vielleicht überraschende Erklärung der triadischen Taufformel" of 28:19b that it makes explicit the activity of the κύριος = θεός and Holy Spirit concerning the birth of the Son in 1:16, 18, 20, 22, 23. He points to the interaction of the same three at the baptism of Jesus in 3:13-17. This correlation is surely intended by the evangelist. Cf. pp. 222 with n. 3, 223 n. 2.

words seems to have no deeper meaning than that of being a characteristic expression of the joyful homage of the disciples who recognize Jesus as the Christ. This galaxy of words may be compared to the other Mattheanisms found, for instance, in 28:9-14: προσκυνέω, ἀδελφός, συνάγω, νυκτός (cf. 2:14), ἡγεμών. This cluster shows the mind and hand of Matthew, without being endowed with any esoteric message.

Conclusion. - The verbal coincidences between Matthew 1-2 and 26-28 are very numerous. But some are fortuitous (e.g., προάγω, νυκτός, ζητέω), or the normal recurrence of the writer's favourite words. The correspondences that stand up to examination as designate concern the identity of Jesus as Christ the Davidic King and Son of God; his rejection by official Jewry contrasting with his obedient acceptance by disciples; Jerusalem's unmessianic interpretation of scripture; the role of Jesus as redeemer from sin; and the unexpected, universal, "Galilean" origin and scope of messianic Israel. There are also contacts other than verbal, such as the stress on conformity to the commands of the angel or of Jesus, and on the fruition of the old economy. But these latter are by no means confined to the two passages under consideration.

These observations show that it would be an exaggeration to classify Matthew 26-28 as a great inclusion rounding off the Gospel by a systematic re-reading or fresh application of the two initial chapters. Neither is Matthew 1-2 a retrojection of 26-28. The evangelist's sense of composing a coherent whole is indicated by the frame words *genesis* and *sunteleia* (1:1 and 28:20). But that does not signify that he intended his first two chapters as an allegory, or even a detailed foreshadowing, of the paschal mystery.

B. THE FUNCTION OF THE GOSPEL OF THE ORIGINS: MATTHEW 1-2

A practical way of defining the function of Matthew 1-2 is to find a suitable title for this passage. These chapters are often called the "Birth Narrative," or the "Infancy Narrative." This title suggests an interest in the life of Jesus as an unfolding story. Such an understanding of the Gospel is not illegitimate, but it has the inconvenience of stressing birth and early years as an event or state, an emphasis absent from Matthew. He has only an aside on the birth in 1:25b and 2:1, and does not deal with the childhood at all. The messianic significance predominates.

A glance at the apocrypha about Jesus' early years suffices to show by contrast that the birth and childhood of Jesus had little interest for the evangelists in comparison with the questions of his origins, authority, and destiny.[1]

Another common heading is "Infancy Gospel." This tones down the biographical interest of "Infancy Narrative" by bringing into focus the religious message, the "Gospel." It is only since the rise of documentary and source criticism that such a division as Infancy Gospel could be identified. The first two chapters of Matthew and Luke came to be seen as using special sources. However, the word "Gospel" brings out what these passages have in common with the rest of the work.

Undoubtedly this title is more apt than the preceding one. But it does not overcome the main defect of Infancy Narrative, namely, the false implication that the early years of Jesus are presented with a peculiar doctrinal content. It is rather the Davidic and divine origins of the child which are explored. Secondly, Jesus is situated in relation to the old economy by Matthew's genealogy, the quotations from the prophets, and reminiscences of David and Moses. Jesus is viewed as the Christ, not in relation to psychology or socio-economic milieu, but in the light of the divine consistency and approval. A final objection is one which applies with equal force to the next suggested title. It is, that the content and literary techniques of Matthew 1-2 accord so well with those of the rest of the Gospel, that it is not possible to set them completely apart under a separate rubric.[2]

---

1 W. Knörzer (*Wir haben seinen Stern gesehen. Verkündigung der Geburt Christi nach Lukas und Matthäus* [Werkhefte zur Bibelarbeit, 11; Stuttgart: KBW, 1967]) calls *Kindheitsgeschichte* "missverständlich" (p. 9), and "irreführend" (p. 202).

2 J. L. McKenzie ("Infancy Gospels," *Dictionary of the Bible* [Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965] 387-388) considers that the composition of Mt 1-2 is the same in principle as that of the rest of the Gospel, and that these chapters "are intended to present the real Jesus as he was known by the Church, and differ from the rest of the Gospels only in that the material which was available was more scanty." Compare Schürmann, *Lukas*, 11, 20; Le Déaut, "A propos," 408 n. 7; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 13-14; B. Vawter, *This Man Jesus. An Essay Towards a New Testament Christology* (New York: Doubleday, 1973) 183-184; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 56. A. Paul, who wrote, "l'apellation Évangile de l'enfance est forcée et peu adéquate" (*L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 174), later proposed "Evangiles de la naissance" ("Bulletin de littérature intertestamentaire," *RSR* 64 [1976] 555).

A designation of the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke which is becoming more current is one which, unlike the two titles just considered, is not based on form criticism and special content and source. The chapters are referred to as the "Prologue" to each Gospel. The term reflects the approach of redaction criticism, which concentrates on the author's purpose, outlook, and peculiarities of expression. It, too, has serious limitations. The analogy with the beginnings of Old Testament books suggests that only the first verse or verses of the Synoptics should be considered as introductory. Despite the many similarities between Matthew 1-2 and the remainder of the work, the heading "Prologue," in its meaning of systematic summary and preview of a book's main themes, is not appropriate. These chapters lack allusion to the preaching and healing, which are so important in the public ministry that occupies more than half of Matthew. The community of disciples and the resurrection are beneath the surface of Matthew 1-2, yet they play no insignificant role in the rest of the work. However, the most serious defect of the description "Prologue" is the palpable fact that the life of Christ begins and progresses in these two chapters. There is a real beginning, not a static preview or theological synthesis. Matthew's notations of time and place insert the infant Jesus into history. The frequency of the fulfilment formula quotations indicates that the divine plan is already being put into effect.

The importance of the theological message, compared to the historical "data," is certainly great in Matthew 1-2; but it is also considerable in 3-28. A general narrative, even "historical," intention exists in Matthew 3-28, and is therefore to be expected in the opening chapters. Consequently, the pair of initial chapters is rightly termed the start of the action.[1] It is the beginning of the story, and as such forms the premise

---

1 "L'inizio della vicenda" according to G. Danieli, "Matteo 1-2 e l'intenzione di narrare fatti accaduti," *RivB* 16 (1968) 187-199, 192. Mt 1-2 belongs to the "'Geschichte Jesu Christi' . . . Die Antwort auf die Fragen, wer Jesus ist und woher er kommt, bildet ein Teil des Evangeliums, nicht dessen blossen Vorspann" (Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 24). That history, the execution of God's plan, begins in Mt 2 is deduced from the unwonted frequency of fulfilment formula quotations therein by Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 101. Radermakers (*Matthieu*, 20) calls these chapters, "Prélude et première étape." H. B. Green is categoric that Mt 1-2 "is no mere prologue to the gospel, but an integral part of it" (*Matthew*, 49). Note also the close association of Mt 1-2 with 3-4, which was outlined on p. 103.

for the subsequent narrative.[1] The unbroken series of quotations marks the continuity. The migration of Joseph with the child and its mother to Nazareth is explained by means of a quotation (2:23). The two other major changes of residence are provided with a similar commentary: the settlement in Capernaum (4:12-16), and the entry into Jerusalem (21:2-5).

In so far as Matthew's opening chapters anticipate the career of the Christ, they do so because they are gospel material, rather than because their author set out to preface his work by a systematic prospectus. To re-apply an image of C. H. Lohr, every sizable passage of the gospel narrative resembles a window pane, which both frames the scene at present contemplated, and at the same time reflects the features of the whole Christ, who, so to speak, "looks over the shoulder of the evangelist" as he writes.[2] In conclusion, the designation Prologue is sufficiently grounded in the synthetic nature of gospel material to gain plausibility. It is easily comprehensible to the modern reader. But it is misleading in so far as it introduces too sharp a caesura between the two opening chapters and their sequel, and attributes an abstract intention to the evangelists of anticipating their whole work. This intention has not been verified for them, and has no strict equivalent in the Old Testament.

A fourth title, current among German-speaking scholars, is *Vorgeschichte*. Presumably the implication is, that these chapters incorporate episodes from a period preceding the encounter of Jesus with John the Baptist. This is the first event shared by the four Gospels, and is prominent in the kerygma. If this is its exact connotation, it is a serviceable, neutral title. Unfortunately, *Vorgeschichte* has no exact English or Romance equivalent. The literal translation, "prehistory," is either too technical and limited, or too vague. For students of ancient cultures, prehistory means the period before the survival of documentary evidence. An adequate English rendering would have to be a paraphrase, such as "the pre-baptism narrative cycle." This is cumbersome, but it does not prejudge the chapters' function, as does Prologue; nor does it give the wrong

---

1 See Danieli, "L'influsso reciproco," esp. p. 208: "Mt 1-2 vuol essere *anche un inizio*, vuol collegarsi con il restante vangelo sinottico come una sua premessa." He deals with the relation between Mt 1-2 and 3-28 on pp. 178-179, 184, 205, 209.

2 "Oral Techniques," 416.

temporal emphasis of Infancy Narrative, or even Infancy Gospel. The term "narrative" of the pre-baptism cycle indicates the absence of words of Jesus. "Cycle" conveys the structural and temporal cohesion, and homogeneity of substance, which stamp these chapters as a redactional unit.

A closely argued objection to calling Matthew 1-2 a *Vorgeschichte* has been elaborated by Krister Stendahl.[1] He believes that Matthew's concerns are those of the first chapter of John: an apologia for the titles and Nazareth origin of Jesus. How can he be Son of David (Matthew 1), and yet come from Nazareth (Matthew 2)? He understands these chapters as presenting an abstract, static, scriptural thesis. Only with Matthew 3:1 does the account of the events begin. Consequently, there is no story element to merit the name (*Vor-*)*geschichte*.

On the contrary, Stendahl overlooks several aspects of these chapters which stamp them as narrative. Although he realizes that the "christological geography" continues past chapter 2, he fails to draw the conclusion that at least this chapter is the start of the gospel story. Again, his contention that Matthew 2 is structured by an itinerary from Bethlehem, via Egypt, Ramah, and Judea, to Nazareth, is only part of the truth. The name of Herod appears throughout: 2:1, 3, 7, 12, 13, 16, 19, 22. He features at the beginning of each episode (verses 1, 13, 16, 19), three times as in some way its motive (verses 13, 16, 19). This factor alone provides a story element in Matthew 2. Lastly, the common tradition underlying the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke includes a train of events: the virgin Mary, before she went to live with her betrothed, Joseph the Davidid, conceived a son by a holy spirit; after they had lived together, she bore a son at Bethlehem during the reign of King Herod; and afterwards all three left Judea and settled in Nazareth. It is true that

---

1 Stendahl's "Quis et Unde?" is probably the most seminal study of its length on Mt 1-2. In his 1967 Preface to *The School of St. Matthew* he defends his views, particularly against G. Strecker (pp. viii-ix). Stendahl interprets these chapters as a literary creation furnishing an apologetic interpretation of Christ's Name ("Quis?" in Mt 1) and Locale ("Unde?" in Mt 2). Brief critiques of his position are found in Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 94 n. 114; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 47; and, implicitly, in Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 61, 63. A. Paul (*L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 172, cf. pp. 47, 94-96) expands his questions into "*Qui* est Jésus et *Comment* est-il venu au monde (ch. 1)? *D'Où* vient-il et *Quand* est-il né (ch. 2)?" (But on pp. 146-147 he extends "*Qui?*" to the triptych 1:1-25; 2:13-15; 2:19-23!). Cf. Brown, *Messiah*, 53.

most of the overlapping material contains bare facts - names, times, places - rather than an account of events. But a story element is implied at least by the conception from a holy spirit of the Davidic Christ, by the relationship of Mary and Joseph, and by the journey from Judea to Nazareth. Therefore, Matthew 1-2 presents more than a thesis to be defended, or a theologoumenon to be explained. It recounts a series of events which (whatever their empiric factuality) consummates one process, the old economy, and thereby initiates the good news.

Conclusion. - Infancy Narrative or Gospel, and Prologue, have been found inadequate or misleading titles for Matthew 1-2. *Vorgeschichte* needs a paraphrase in English, such as, "pre-baptism narrative cycle." "Quis et Unde?" has been adjudged restrictive. A. Schlatter[1] has suggested: "God's Activity at the Birth of Jesus." This is apt in that the genealogy, conception, angel, and quotations manifest God at work. But the word "Birth" narrows the perspective unduly. "The Appearance (or, Coming) of the Christ" is certainly adequate,[2] but rather vague. Probably this type of redaction criticism approach will evolve a satisfactory title. At present, either "Pre-Baptism (Narrative) Cycle" or "The Gospel of the Origins of Jesus Christ" is acceptable. The latter both connects Matthew 1-2 with the dramatic history of Jesus the Messiah ("Gospel"), and points up its characteristic subject matter in a comprehensive way ("Origins"). Origins recalls *Geneseis*: the Old Testament *genea*logy and quotations, *genesis* from the Spirit, the origin of the Son from the Lord, his engrafting into the dynasty of David, and his Nazareth roots.

---

1 In *Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1929; repr. 1963) 1: "Gottes Werk bei der Geburt Jesu."

2 Cf. Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 59: "Das Werden des Christus"; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 6: "Das Werden Jesu 1,1-4,16"; Green, *Matthew*, 49: "The Origins of the Christ." Nellessen (*Das Kind*, 25) selects "Einführung" as a title for Mt 1-2. "Introduction" is satisfactory, provided that it is held in mind that *intro*-duction implies participation, and initiation into an action. An introduction is all of a piece with what it introduces (the Gospel), and does not stand apart from it like a *pro*-logue. It is the premise and beginning of the whole.

P A R T I I I

T H E M E S S A G E O F M A T T H E W 1 - 2:

R O Y A L C O V E N A N T C H R I S T O L O G Y

PART III

THE MESSAGE OF MATTHEW 1 - 2: ROYAL COVENANT CHRISTOLOGY

CHAPTER 6

THE SUBJECTIVE DIMENSION: THE CHRIST WITH US

Neither in Matthew 1-2 nor in the rest of the New Testament is there a division between objective and subjective christology - between Christ in himself and Christ for us. Soteriology also infuses the christology of the Fathers and later theologians. For example, Thomas Aquinas is so steeped in this tradition that the *Pars Tertia* of his *Summa Theologiae* deals "de ipso omnium Salvatore ac beneficiis eius," and embraces the incarnation, the grace and life of the Saviour, the sacraments, and human destiny. The subsequent artificial division of dogmatic treatises into those concerning Christ and those expounding the Redemption has been abandoned by recent scholars.[1] In various ways they try to involve man in their attempts to

---

1 E.g., the influential works by D. M. Baillie, *God Was In Christ. An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement* (London: Faber and Faber, 1956); W. Pannenberg, *Jesus: God and Man* (London, 1968), who writes, "Almost all Christological conceptions have had soteriological motifs. Changes in the soteriological interest, in man's understanding of salvation, explain, at least in part, the different forms Christology has taken at different times" (p. 39). See further the comments on recent christology of G. O'Collins, "Theological Trends: Jesus in Current Theology II," *The Way* 17 (1977) 51-64. It is noteworthy that scripturally based works on christology take account of the redemption and the implications for man, e.g., B. Vawter, *This Man Jesus*, 71-81, etc.; Ch. Duquoc, *Christologie, essai dogmatique* II. *Le Messie* (Paris: Cerf, 1972) 171-280; C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge, 1977) 107-126. M. Hengel *Son of God*, 92) observes that "New Testament christology . . . develops in an indissoluble dialectic between God's saving activity and man's answer."

understand, to appropriate, Christ. Among the approaches and models employed are: the Mystical Body (Émile Mersch); man as symbol, cipher, and "grammar" of God (Karl Rahner); the experience of history which, so to speak, creates a Christ-shaped space (Jürgen Moltmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg); the world as symbiosis and process (Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Ansfried Hulsbosch, and Norman Pittenger); the sacramental principle (Edward Schillebeeckx); and the principle of incarnation - understood in an economico-political sense (Johannes B. Metz and Gustavo Gutiérrez), or in a historico-anthroplogical way (John A. T. Robinson and Hans Küng), or in a historico-philosophical manner (Dietrich Wiederkehr and Walter Kasper). Thus the New Testament witness to Christ being - like God - "personal but more than individual" (C. F. D. Moule), reverberates in twentieth century dogmatics.

If a tag must be found to describe this very traditional and holistic christology, it might be termed "participatory christology," meaning that man and his salvation, and his response in faith and love, must enter into the scheme.[1] Perhaps the verse of scripture which expresses this approach in the most programmatic fashion is First John 2:3, "By this we may be sure that we know him, if we keep his commandments." The Gospel setting of Matthew's christology is a narrative which introduces us to Jesus The Christ *in the web of relationships which were his life* - his relation to his Father, to the Spirit and the spirits, to the people of the promises, to Jerusalem and Galilee, to Jew and Gentile, to opponent and disciple. Quite simply, the response to Jesus is an integral element of Matthean, not to say of all New Testament, christology. And it was in no wise different in the old dispensation, since, in practice, Yahweh could not be divorced from his covenant-love and the covenanted people it shaped: "I am the Lord *your* God"; "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Matthew 22:32). Participatory christology is covenant christology.

---

1 As L. S. Thornton (*The Dominion of Christ*, 58-59) eloquently says, in the historical drama of revelation, whose author is God, "Jesus is not simply the principal actor; he is the whole action in which each of the actors in turn plays his part." Compare P. Beauchamp, "Jésus-Christ n'est pas seul. L'accomplissement des Écritures dans la Croix," *RSR* 65 (1977) 243-278, e.g., "Jésus est connu comme Christ et comme Fils par le don que lui confère le Père, de s'agréger un peuple. Jésus est connu dans son peuple" (p. 243); cf. p. 270, and his application of his thesis to Mt 2:18 on pp. 273-274. See also pp. 135, 138, 192-193, 243-244.

For the sake of logical exposition, Matthew's narrative theology is here crudely separated into the more "subjective" communitarian element in Chapter 6; and the more "objective" grace or identity of Christ element in Chapter 7.[1] There is no intention of murdering to dissect, but of distinguishing in order to relish the richness of the living reality.

A. MATTHEW 1:1-17 - THE KERYGMA OF THE GENEALOGY

These seventeen verses are a prose poem, which echoes much of what the Magnificat and Benedictus say in poetic mode. The name "Jesus (the) Christ" has become such a commonplace that it is well to remember that it is found but seven times in the Synoptics, and six of these instances are in Matthew. In the fourteen cases in Acts the combination is associated with the resurrection, baptism, faith, and miracles. "Jesus Christ," therefore, is no cliché, but an embodiment of the faith of the Early Church.[2] The threefold fourteen chimes in with Matthew's predilection for

---

1 Dispassionate objectivity has become a precarious notion in twentieth century theories of knowledge. That the interests and values of the knower partially determine his perception is admitted variously by such philosophers as Joseph Maréchal, Michael Polanyi, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Bernard J. F. Lonergan. This association of truth with relationship, commitment, and response, resembles the attitude of the Bible. Such an understanding bypasses the badly posed question whether New Testament christology is functional or ontological. It is both, and necessarily so; cf. W. Kasper, *Jesus the Christ* (London/New York, 1976) 164-168, and also pp. 110-111. See also above p. 81 n. 1.
A systematic theologian like Karl Rahner tries to refashion ontology so that it can integrate the "subjective" and functional. His principle is, that being ("ontic") and consciousness ("onto-logical") are at root identical. See his "The Theology of the Symbol," in *Theological Investigations* IV (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1966) 221-252, esp. pp. 228-234, 244-245; "Jesus Christ" in *Sacramentum Mundi. An Encyclopedia of Theology* 3 (eds. K. Rahner, J. Alfaro, etc.; London: Burns & Oates, 1969) 174-209, at pp. 199-200. Leonardo Boff's *Jésus-Christ libérateur. Essai de christologie critique* (Paris: Cerf, 1974) may not have the solidity of Louis Bouyer's *Le Fils éternel* (Paris: Cerf, 1973), but its variety of approaches (e.g., Ch. X-XIII) recalls the covenant christology of the original Gospel setting.

2 Cf. Pascual Calvo, "Genealogía," 119. Apparently Mt 1:18-25 is an exposition (midrash) of the name "Jesus" (vv. 18, 21, 23) and the title "Christ" (vv. 20b, 24-25), showing how they radiate the child with the twin light of Son of David and of God. The essence of the Messiah is condensed into "Jesus Christ" (1:1, 16, 18), and his rejection rightly hinges around these words - 16:21; 27:17, 22 (and see n. 1 on p. 99). A dependence of Mt 1 on Mk 1:1 is wholly unproven (against Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 225; Green, *Matthew*, 52).

numerical arrangement.[1] Since some supplementary phrases in the Old Testament sources of the genealogy are omitted (contrast 1 Chronicles 2:10 and Matthew 1:4), it is reasonable to assume that the nine additions made to the list of names are of special import.

The first four additions give equilibrium to the initial series of generations, since they are in the third and fourth positions from its beginning and end: verses 2c, Judah's brothers; 3a, Tamar; 5a, Rahab; 5b, Ruth. The brothers and Tamar are found in Chronicles; but Rahab is nowhere mentioned as an ancestress of David, and Ruth is found only in Ruth 4:13. Yet it should not be overlooked that not one of these four supplements tallies exactly with Chronicles or Ruth 4:18-22.[2]

The twin expansions, "Judah and his brothers . . . Jechoniah and his brothers" (1:2 and 11), highlight a word which is significant for the evangelist. At the two periods of persecution and diaspora (Egypt in 1:2 and Babylon in 1:11) the corporate unity of Israel - "brothers" - is recalled.[3] The same term designates an authentic disciple in a fashion peculiar to Matthew: 18:21, 35; 23:8; 25:40; 28:10, where Matthew alone identifies the brother with the disciples.[4] Elsewhere the evangelist often refers to the special unity and destiny of Israel (1:21b, "his people"; 2:6c, "my people Israel"; 10:6, 23; 15:24-26; 19:28).[5] Therefore, the addition of "and his

---

1 See references in n. 1 on p. 102, and Peretto, "Ricerche," 152; Weinreb, *Die jüdischen Wurzeln*, 66-67, 82-89 (!); Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 81-83, 228-229.

2 In 1 Chron 2:1-2 the brothers of Judah are not listed as such, but are named as the sons of Israel. Gen 44:14 seems to be the sole occurrence of "Judah and his brothers," though compare Gen 49:8, "Judah, your brothers shall praise you." The latter is an important messianic passage. 1 Chron 2:4 reads, "Judah's daughter-in-law Tamar also bore him Perez and Zerah." In Mt 1:3 the sons are mentioned first.

3 See in part Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 4-5; Green, *Matthew*, 52; and in particular, Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 151-152 (following A. Loisy).

4 A table of Mt's use of ἀδελφός is found in Thompson, *Matthew's Advice*, 176-177 n. 3. See also Malina, "Literary Structure," 102 n. 1; P. Christian, *Jesus und seine geringsten Brüder. Mt 25,31-46 redaktionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (Leipzig, 1975) 28-35.

5 Two writings betraying contact with logia drawn on by Matthew open with a reference to the twelve tribes (Jas 1:1), and to the diaspora (1 Pet 1:1; and note ἀδελφότης in 2:17 and 5:9 - only here in NT). Mt's community emphasis is dealt with by H. Geist in *Jesus in den Evangelien. Ein Symposion* (ed. W. Pesch; Stuttgart, 1970) 105-126.

brothers" to the names of the two ancestors of Christ who experienced forced migration and suffering is of a piece with Matthew's insistence on the brotherly community of the Messiah, which will know persecution, ostracism, and exile as did Israel of old.

Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the wife of Uriah were probably considered Gentiles in Matthew's milieu. Their grafting into the house of the Christ would harmonize with the First Gospel's interest in pagans, and foreshadow the universal mission.[1] The magi are certainly heathens, who bear the tribute of the Gentiles to the royal Messiah, whom they call "the King of the Jews."[2] Alone of the Synoptics Matthew uses γῆ of a circumscribed area. He seems to prefer it to χώρα for regions encompassed by the Land of Promise, e.g., 2:6, 20, 21; 9:26, 31; probably also 10:15 and 11:24 of Abraham's Sodom. It may be significant that where the Septuagint has χώρα Ζαβουλων in Isaiah 8:23, Matthew cites this Israelite territory as γῆ Ζαβουλὼν in 4:15, although in the following verse he coincides with the LXX ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, hinting that χώρα is suitable for a benighted pagan land here as well as in 8:28 of the swine-eating Gadarenes, and in 2:12 of the country of the magi.

Besides the four Gentile ancestresses and the pagan magi, Galilee of the Gentiles (2:22 and 4:15) could be adduced as an element of incipient universalism in the Gospel of the Origins. The interpretation that the four women foreshadow, and legitimize, the catholic significance of Jesus The Christ cannot be excluded. But it is unlikely to be the primary

---

1 See also pp. 62-63 and n. 1 on p. 95; further, K. W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," *JBL* 66 (1947) 165-172; G. Rinaldi, "Il messianismo tra 'le Genti' in S. Matteo," *RivB* 2 (1954) 318-328; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 124-142; Stendahl, *School*, xi-xiii; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 160-162, 339, 344-345; Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel," 33-39. The equality before God of Jew and Gentile is understood here by H. Stegemann, "'Die des Uria': Zur Bedeutung der Frauennamen in der Genealogie von Matthäus 1,1-17," in *Tradition und Glaube* [Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn] (eds. G. Jeremias, etc.; Göttingen, 1971) 246-276, 276; Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 9, 22, 37-38. - Interestingly, the Hebrew gives the wife of Uriah (Mt 1:6b) the same name as the Canaanite wife of Judah, Bathshua, in 1 Chron 3:5 (cf. 2:3). The messianic line is of mixed blood.

2 See p. 104. On this distinction between Israel and the "Jews" in Matthew cf. J. M. Grintz, "Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple," *JBL* 79 (1960) 32-47, 33-36; G. Strecker, "The Concept of History in Matthew," *JAAR* 35 (1967) 219-230, 223 n. 17; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 97; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 124-125.

meaning, since it does not relate these four to the fifth woman of the genealogy, Mary. Consequently, it is advisable to find a more immediate reason for their inclusion. Of the many explanations offered, the most acceptable is also one of the most traditional: all five women show divine providence at work in an extraordinary way. Matthew 1 welcomes this evidence that the Lord God has his own logic, which all too few of his people have been able to follow. Neither human malice nor racial prejudice excluded Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, or Bathsheba, from the blessing promised to Abraham. Like Mary, each had a (not necessarily sinful) irregularity and a marriage difficulty.[1] All this provides an apt setting for the genesis of the Christ through the intervention of the Spirit. The five heroines show forth the divine fidelity, his sovereign power and overriding purpose at work - and so do both the opening chapters of Matthew.[2]

There are some other traces of the evangelist's hand. Jesus "who is called" Christ is one of his expressions, v.g., 27:17 and 22. The migration of Israel in 1:11-12 anticipates the later journeys of Jesus, but there is no verbal echo. The threefold articulation of the genealogy tallies with the evangelist's predilection for triads. Yet the division of the time of promise into three periods has no clear echo in the rest of the Gospel.[3] Although the deftly modulated series of names and generations has a certain smooth anonymity, the genealogy so coheres with the Gospel that it is probably a creation of Matthew.[4]

---

1 This is evident for Tamar and Bathsheba. For the other three, see Zakowitch, "Rahab," 1-5; Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 166-170 (Ruth); F. Hofmans, "Maria altijd maagd," *ColBG* 8 (1962) 487-494.

2 To the authors in favour of this opinion cited by Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies* (p. 157), add: the commentaries on Mt by Albright and Mann, Hill, Radermakers, Green, and Sabourin; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 232; Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key," 215-216; Brown, *Messiah*, 74.

3 The period of John the Baptist is not to be distinguished from that of Jesus; see W. Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS 7; Cambridge: University Press, 1968) 28-35; Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 30 n. 12; Barr, "Drama of Matthew's Gospel," 352-353.

4 See the conclusion on p. 28; and Radermakers, *Mt*, 30-33, and the authors listed in E. L. Abel, "The Genealogies of Jesus *O XPICTOC*," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 203-210, 205 n.6. M. D. Johnson's apologetic interpretation of the genealogy is weakened by his treatment of the wife of Uriah, and his tenuous association of Rahab with the tribe of Judah (*Biblical Genealogies*, 139-228, esp. pp. 163-165, 170-175).

B. MATTHEW 1:18-25 - THE GENESIS OF JESUS THE CHRIST

After discerning some literary and theological traits of the evangelist in this pericope, we will examine the reverberations through the people of the Messiah of the fulfilment of the Lord's plan of salvation.

Matthew has left his mark on the vocabulary, the syntax, and the catechetical emphases of these eight verses. His hand is recognizable in Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων, ἐγερθείς, and the fulfilment formula in verse 22. Terms which accord with his usage, but do not postulate his redaction, include οὕτως (cf. 19:10; 26:54), ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἐφάνη,[1] μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν. The Septuagint has ἄγγελος more than three hundred times, ἄγγελος κυρίου some fifty-four times, and φαίνω more than fifty. Yet nowhere in the Bible outside Matthew are these three terms found together. Indeed, the angel of the Lord occurs only eleven times in the New Testament: Matthew 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19; 28:2; Luke 1:11; 2:9; Acts 5:19; 8:26; 12:7, 23. It is remarkable that, with the possible exception of Matthew 28:2, the context in every case is the infancy of Jesus or of the Church. Furthermore, six times in the Gospel of the Origins *Kyrios* is applied to God as distinct from Jesus. This usage, however, occurs elsewhere in Matthew only in Old Testament quotations, and a few sayings of Jesus tinged with prayer, 9:38; 11:25 (and see also 23:39; 28:2). The same phenomenon appears in Luke 1-2, where God is called *Kyrios* about twenty-six times, but almost never elsewhere in the Gospel.[2] It may well be that "angel *of the Lord*" is a mark of what may be termed sacred prose, a style employed to convey the primordial action of God. The expression, therefore, may indicate a special source for the pre-baptism cycle, rather than characterize the evangelist's own style. Even though the threefold ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐφάνη|φαίνεται of Matthew 1:20, 2:13 and 19, is unique in the whole of scripture, the concentration of the phrase in the Joseph stories sug-

---

1 Where Mk has a historic present, Mt usually has an aorist, see Allen, *Matthew*, xx (drawing on J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 143-149); Lagrange, *Matthieu*, XCII-XCIII. Yet Mt often uses the historic present; cf Schenk, "Das Präsens Historicum," 464-466. Therefore, the ἐφάνη may not be redactional. Compare Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 236.

2 Cf. Schürmann, *Lukas*, 142 n. 319; S. Zedda, "Un aspetto della cristologia di Luca: il titolo *Kyrios* in Lc 1-2 e nel resto del III Vangelo," *RasT* 13 (1972) 305-315, - "uno degli elementi del colore giudaico precristiano" (p. 307 n. 4); Knox, *Sources II*, 125 - Jewish Christian Greek.

gests that it belonged to the writer's source.[1]

The peculiar inversion of the word order in 1:18a, as well as the terms ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς (1:19) and γεννηθέν (1:20c), show an obvious redactional accomodation to 1:16. The frequent genitive absolutes, and especially those followed by ἰδού (1:20; 2:1, 13, 19), are Matthean. The latter construction is found eleven times in the Gospel, but occurs elsewhere in the Synoptics only in Luke 22:47. Since no example of καὶ ἰδού has been found in secular Greek, the author must have borrowed it from the Septuagint.[2] But his usage has several peculiarities. Only once, in 17:3, does he follow the Septuagint practice of placing (καὶ) ἰδού after a twofold καί plus an aorist. Secondly, in Matthew alone is it found after an aorist genitive absolute. It is noteworthy that these four instances are all found in his Gospel of the Origins. Yet this hardly justifies their attribution to another hand. It may be explained by the fact that the narrative here is more onward-moving and dramatic than that of the subsequent chapters. A third departure from Greek Old Testament use is Matthew's consistent prefacing of angelic apparitions with ἰδού: 1:20; 2:13, 19; 4:11; 28:2. In short, the employment of ἰδού in Matthew 1-2 is after the evangelist's manner.[3]

A final point concerning Matthean formulas is overtly theological, namely, the obedience formula of 1:24-25, which has close parallels in the carefully edited 21:6-7. Matthew understands the words of the angel and of Isaiah to contain three instructions: to marry Mary, to name her son Jesus, and to respect the fact that "a *virgin* . . . *shall bear* a son." The explicit mention of non-consummation in 1:25a is almost certainly in deference

---

1 Each time the phrase is augmented by κατ' ὄναρ, which is also found in 2:12 and 27:19. In the latter verse the expression is probably a case of Matthew standardizing his vocabulary; see Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 167-168, 187. It does not support a redactional origin for the appearing of the angel of the Lord.

2 Consult P. Fiedler, *Die Formel "und siehe" im Neuen Testament* (SANT 20; München: Kösel, 1969), esp. pp. 23-29. Fiedler develops a theology of καὶ ἰδού in Matthew: it emphasizes the divinity of Christ, and the workings of divine providence (pp. 52-58, 82).

3 In Mt 1-2 ἰδού follows the fourth Matthean pattern identified by A. Vargas-Machuca, "(Καὶ) ἰδού en el estilo narrativo de Mateo," *Bib* 50 (1969) 233-244, 241. See also Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 180-183, 267 n. 186.

to the requirement of the parturition by a virgin implicit in Isaiah's declaration of the divine will.[1] Obedience to the divine will as revealed in the Law and the prophets and the teaching of Jesus (7:21-27; 28:19-20) is a keynote of the First Gospel. The fulfilment formula quotations show the supremacy of God's providence, and the requisite cooperation of man.[2] Unlike the rest of the New Testament, Matthew speaks of the more intimate θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου (7:21; 12:50; 18:14; and cf. 21:31), but never of the will of man or even of God. Moreover, the first and last occurrence of the noun highlights the importance of the example of the dutiful Jesus: "Thy will be done" (6:10 and 26:42; compare 11:29).[3] Obedience to the Father and to Jesus is the theme of the peroration of the Sermon on the Mount, 7:15-27. The parables of the thirteenth chapter revolve around knowing and doing the will of the Father.[4] The parting words of the Christ crown the Gospel's teaching on discipleship: "Make disciples of all the nations . . .

---

1 On the obedience formula see p. 33. This understanding of Joseph's continence was proposed by A. Vögtle, "Mt 1,25 und die 'Virginitas B. M. Virginis post partum'," *TQ* 147 (1967) 28-39. He is followed by Pesch, "Ausführungsformel," 86 (with a reference to J. Blinzler); Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 242; Brown, *Messiah*, 132, 155.

2 Even a superficial examination of Matthew shows the primacy he accords to Scripture as the ever valid word of God. The miracles of Jesus are presented as the carrying into effect of Isaiah's prophecy: 8:17 and 11:5. Further in Held, *Tradition and Interpretation*, 253-259. Again, Jesus prefers mercy to sacrifice, not for some abstract ethical reason, but because God - whom man should imitate (5:48) - had declared through Hosea that such was his desire: 9:13 and 12:7; cf. Held, pp. 258-259, and G. Barth on pp. 82-83, with the apt comment of Cope, *A Scribe Trained*, 72-73. In 12:40 Mt makes absolutely clear the conformity of the sign of Jonah with scripture. Compare the two pack animals in 21:4-7, and the use of Wis 2:13-20 in 27:40b and of Ps 22:9 in 27:43. This literalist acceptance of scripture as the word of God may explain the bald "God said" of 15:4, and the arrangement of vice list in 15:21 according to the order of the Decalogue.

3 On the fatherhood of God in Mt see E. P. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1960) 58-60.

4 This is the conclusion of Kingsbury, *Parables*, 131, 137; J. Dupont, "Le point de vue de Matthieu dans le chapitre des paraboles," in *Mt: Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier), 221-259, 250. It is no coincidence that servant (δοῦλος) is one of Mt's terms for a christian. See Kingsbury, pp. 68-69; and the table of the master-servant relationship in the Matthean parables in Thompson, *Matthew's Advice*, 210 n. 36. Cf. J. Czerski, "Christozentrische Ekklesiologie im Matthäusevangelium," *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 55-66, 64-65.

teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you." Matthew's church exists only where the will of the Father is carried out.[1]

The title given to this section - "The Genesis of Jesus the Christ" - is deliberately general. The pericope can be seen in its precise Matthean perspective only after its message about Jesus the Christ himself has been disengaged in Chapter Seven below. "Genesis" can encompass the generation by the holy spirit and the divine filiation of the Saviour ("Jesus"), as well as Joseph's righteous cooperation and the resultant incorporation of the child into the Davidic messianic line ("Christ"). The following necessarily partial exposition of the evangelist's theological editing may conveniently be centred around the qualification of Joseph as δίκαιος in 1:19. This is a vital element of the passage's participatory christology.

Matthew uses δίκαιος in a more than occasional manner, as shown by the fact that only one of his fourteen uses of this word in reference to persons has a Synoptic parallel, namely, 9:13. The term applies to men of the old economy: the yearnings of the prophets and the just, 13:17; the tombs of the just and the righteous Abel, 23:29 and 35. In the same vein are the two references to δικαιοσύνη outside the Sermon on the Mount - 3:15 and 21:32. Conversely, it describes the just of the last times (13:43, 49; 25:37, 46), and also of the present: 1:19; 5:45; 9:13; 10:41; 27:19, 24.[2] It is unlikely that the word ever refers to a special class of Christians, "those

---

1 See Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 187-211; Strecker, "Concept of History," 230: "The church represents the ethical demand in time." Mt is "nomistic" in the sense that he strives to regulate his church's activity by proposing as its norms the words and deeds of Jesus; cf. Schweizer, "Observance of the Law," 214-220, 223-236; also, Bornkamm, *Tradition and Redaction*, 35-37; U. Luz, "Die Jünger im Matthäusevangelium," *ZNW* 62 (1971) 141-171, 151, 163; É. Cothenet, "Les prophètes chrétiens dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu," *Mt: Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier), 281-308, 291-292, 307-308; Thysman, *Communauté*, 38-43.
The Gospel of the Origins is in perfect agreement with the rest of Mt when it highlights the prompt obedience of Joseph and the magi to the word both of the angel and of the prophets: 1:24-25; 2:5-9, 12, 14, 21, 22. Compare Pesch, "Ausführungsformel," 90-91; Davis, "Tradition and Redaction," 410, 419; and the more general considerations of Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 280-286; Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 138-150.

2 Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 247-248) concludes that Mt uses δίκαιος as "a theological indeed *heilsgeschichtlich* category, which comprises all that long line of the 'suffering just'" from Abel to Jesus and his followers. Consequently, he doubts that δίκαιος is redactional in 1:19, because of its predominantly legal and ethical sense there. But is not the harried Joseph one who suffers? and who realizes prophecy?

in the community who witness, instruct and teach."[1] Rather, the word signifies in Matthew conformity to the will of the Father.[2] The essential link between δικαιοσύνη and conduct is illustrated by the fact that its opposite in 13:41-43 and 23:28 is ἀνομία, lawlessness. In turn, ἀνομία signifies the absence of ἀγάπη. Rampant lawlessness chills love according to 24:12.[3] In this way worthy conduct completes the circle joining justice to love. Yet Matthew's stress on mercy is not impaired by his respect for justice. The testimony is manifold: "Blessed are the merciful" (5:7); "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice" (9:13; 12:7); the parable of the merciful lord and the ruthless servant (18:21-35; compare 6:12, 14-15); "The weightier things of the law, justice and mercy and faith" (23:23); the works of

---

1 Against D. Hill, "Δίκαιοι as a Quasi-Technical Term," *NTS* 11 (1964/65) 296-302; Cothenet, "Les prophètes chrétiens," 294-295, 298. With Kingsbury, *Parables*, 100-101; J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul. A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry* (SNTSMS 20; Cambridge: University Press, 1972) 139-140, cf. pp. 131-135.

2 This ethical, in contrast to forensic, understanding of δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη in Mt is the common one, e.g., Strecker, *Weg*, 149-158, also pp. 177-181, 231-232, 247-248; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 146-147, 183-184, 203, 221; Hill, *Greek Words*, 120-130; Ziesler, *Righteousness*, 140; J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes. Le problème littéraire, le message doctrinal*, Tome III, *Les Béatitudes, Les Evangélistes* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1973) 213-305 (esp. p. 304), 544-545, 671-672. The Matthean legal, but not legalistic, flavour of righteousness is brought out by authors who, in various ways, show how it is conditioned by the teaching, example, and achievement of Jesus: A. Descamps, "Le Christianisme comme Justice dans le Premier Evangile," *ETL* 22 (1946) 5-33, 13-25; C. E. Carlston, "The Things that Defile (Mark vii.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark," *NTS* 15 (1968/69) 75-96, 82-86; Meier, *Law and History*, 76-80, 109-110; J. C. Haughey, "Jesus as the Justice of God," in Haughey, ed., *The Faith that does Justice. Examining the Christian Sources for Social Change* (New York, etc.: Paulist Press, 1977) 264-290, 275-282.

3 On antinomianism in Mt see n.2 on p. 97. Mt's subordination of Christian living to love, and the commandments of the risen Christ, is expounded by C. Spicq, *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament. Analyse des textes* (EBib; 3d ed.; Paris: Gabalda, 1966) 11-80 (ἀνομία is dealt with on p. 48 n. 3); Barth, *Tradition and Interpretation*, 75-85; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 196-198, 206-207; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 104-106 (on ἀνομία): Ellis, *Mind and Message*, 150-155; Meier, *Law and History*, 140-161, 168-170.

That the contemporary Jewish notion of righteousness included discretion and kindliness has been amply demonstrated by Spicq, "'Joseph'"; cf. Brown, *Messiah*, 126. An apposite example is Josephus' version of Saul's reply when David refrained from taking vengeance on him: "Thou hast shown thyself this day to have the righteousness of the ancients, who bade those who captured their enemies . . . to spare them" (*Ant.* 6, §290).

mercy in 25:35-36; and the repeated pleas for mercy - 9:27; 15:22; 17:15; 20:30-31. Thus the essential interrelationship of justice and mercy in Matthew suggests that the καί in 1:19 is to be understood as epexegetical,[1] i.e., "Joseph being righteous and *therefore* not wishing to put her to shame."[2]

The justice of Joseph in refusing to marry his pregnant fiancée may just possibly evoke another Matthean peculiarity. Only in this Gospel is there a certain acceptance of repudiation: "except on the ground of unchastity" (5:32), and "except for unchastity" (19:9).[3] It can be argued that Joseph was not legally bound to divorce his compromised bride to be.[4] But here he was faced with what seemed to be a case of "unchastity," that polyvalent πορνεία. One who pursued the "greater righteousness" of 5:20 would be expected to dissociate himself from it. Therefore, his decision to have nothing more to do with Mary may have been the more legal aspect of

---

1 Compare BDF §418, pp. 215-216; Dibelius, *Jungfrauensohn*, 25; P. Nepper-Christensen, "Utugtsklausulen og Josef i Matthaeusevangeliet," *SEÅ* 34 (1969) 122-146, 140 n. 82; Gomá Civit, *Mateo*, 33-34; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 20: "sa *justice* est typiquement juive-mathéenne: c'est une fidélité à la loi, une piété humble et active qui culmine dans un geste concret de miséricorde (5.6, 10, 20; 6.1, 33)"; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 68. Such a blending of justice and mercy agrees with the evangelist's understanding of righteousness expressing itself in love. Contrast Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 248; Brown, *Messiah*, 125-127. See above p. 72 n. 4.

2 The divorce was to be without publicity, λάθρα (1:19). Yet the highly discreet righteousness of Joseph is not to be associated with the justice done in secret (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ) of Mt 6:4 and 6 (against Pesch, "Ausführungsformel," 91). Λάθρα occurs only five times in the New Testament, including three times in the Synoptics. The fact that it is found twice in Mt 1-2 suggests that the evangelist is contrasting the gentle righteousness of Joseph (1:19) with the wily malevolence of Herod (2:7).

3 There is no consensus of opinion concerning these exceptive clauses, as appears from the surveys of L. Sabourin, "The Divorce Clauses (Mt 5:32; 19:9)," *BTB* 2 (1972) 80-86; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Matthean Divorce Texts and some New Palestinian Evidence," *TS* 37 (1976) 197-226, esp. pp. 208-210; Meier, *Law and History*, 140-150. However, it is likely that Mt 5:32 and 19:9 refer to a marriage contracted within the forbidden degrees of relationship. This is certainly not the situation envisaged in 1:19. But Mt does know of the wider use of the term πορνεία for unlawful (not necessarily sinful, in the current moral sense) sexual intercourse, as evinced by 15:19.

4 See X. Léon-Dufour, "L'annonce à Joseph," in his *Études d'Évangile* (Paris, 1965) 67-81, 70; also his earlier publication of it in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur d'André Robert* (Paris: Bloud et Gay, n.d. [1957]) 390-397; and "Le juste Joseph," *NRT* 91 (1959) 225-231.

his righteousness.[1] Thus both the clemency and the firm repudiation of the just Joseph chime in with the tone of the whole Gospel. The justice depicted by Matthew has a definite continuity with that of the Old Testament, properly understood. This link with tradition exemplifies the First Gospel's admirable synthesis of old and new (13:52). Matthew may be said to depict Joseph, as he does John the Baptist,[2] as a "chrétien avant la lettre."[3]

Hitherto it has been presumed that Joseph hesitated to marry Mary through reluctance to extend the name of David to a child of irregular origin. But for reasons theological[4] or sociological[5] it has been asserted that this hesitation was motivated by reverence towards the divine generation of the child in her womb. This opinion has been given a grammatical basis by Xavier Léon-Dufour. He proposes to translate γάρ in 1:20c as introducing an ellipse: "Although [γάρ - 'certes'] what has been conceived in her is from the holy spirit, nevertheless [δέ - 'mais'] she shall bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus."[6] This reverence hypothesis has

---

1 Ἐβουλήθη in 1:19 is best understood as a pluperfect: "he had decided to repudiate her." Compare the pluperfect sense of ἐνεπαύχθη in 2:16; and see Pernot, *Les deux premiers chapitres*, 74; BDF §347 (2), p. 178.

2 Following W. Trilling, W. Wink (*John the Baptist*, 37, 40) shows that Mt subordinates John to Jesus "in such a way that the distinction is itself subordinated to the unity between them . . . Matthew's whole drift is towards the 'Christianization' of John." See n. 3 on p. 119 above.

3 Despite the absence of redactional alignment between Mt 1 and the context of Mt 5:32 and 19:9, Joseph's disapproval of his betrothed may be understood in function of the evangelist's stern attitude to πορνεία (contrast Nepper-Christensen, "Utugtsklausulen," 139-146). Even if this connection be accepted, it would be wholly unwarranted to explain the continence of Joseph in 1:25 by reference to the voluntary eunuchs of 19:12c. The obedience formula of 1:24-25 provides an adequate explanation of his abstinence (cf. p. 122, n. 1). Mt does not allude to the period after the birth of Jesus. But non-consummation of the marriage would accord with Jewish piety: *De vita Mosis* II, §§67-69; J. Massingberd Ford, "Mary's Virginitas Post-Partum and Jewish Law," *Bib* 54 (1973) 269-272.

4 K. Rahner, "Nimm das Kind und seine Mutter," *GeistLeb* 30 (1957) 14-22. This is abbreviated in "St. Joseph's Doubt," *TD* 6 (1958) 169-173.

5 P. Gaechter, *Maria im Erdenleben. Neutestamentliche Studien* (Innsbruck/Wien/München: Tyrolia, 1953), Ch. 2.

6 See the articles cited in n. 4 on p. 125. Some Greek scholars have accepted this syntax: A. Pelletier, "L'annonce à Joseph," *RSR* 54 (1966) 67-68; M. Zerwick, *Graecitas biblica exemplis illustrata* (6th ed.; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1966) 159-161, §§473-477.

precedents in tradition.[1] Léon-Dufour's explanation has been adopted by many.[2] However, his interpretation of Joseph's righteousness as his refusal to intrude himself into the divine work has serious weaknesses.

Firstly, if the γάρ . . . δέ was intended to convey an opposition between conception from the holy spirit and naming by the Davidid Joseph, one would expect to find the δέ after καλέσεις. But the text places it after τέξεται. Again, the use of γάρ . . . δέ elsewhere in the Gospel of the Origins supposes the usual translation, "for/because . . . and," e.g., 1:21-22; 2:2-3, 13-14, 20-21.[3] Later in the Gospel a contrast is by no means often (if ever) indicated, e.g., 3:9-10; 4:17-18. Léon-Dufour's three examples of contrast in Matthew are not convincing. In 18:7 there is πλήν instead of δέ, and in 24:6 ἀλλά! The contrast between the many and the few in the lapidary πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί (22:14) does not exclude the loose translation, "for many are called and few chosen."[4]

---

1 See the references to Eusebius, Ephraem, Pseudo-Basil, Pseudo-Origen, and Theophylact in R. Bulbeck, "The Doubt of St. Joseph," *CBQ* 10 (1948) 296-309; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 170.

2 Besides the authors cited in n. 6 of p. 126, see da Spinetoli, *Introduzione*, 46; J. Daniélou, *The Infancy Narratives* (London, 1968) 40; E. Rasco, "Mt I-II: Structure, Meaning, Reality," *SE* IV/1 (Berlin, 1968) 214-230, 219; A. Suhl, "Der Davidssohn im Mt.-Evangelium," *ZNW* 59 (1968) 57-81, 62-68; Peretto, "Ricerche," 158-160; Winandy, *Naissance*, 49-51; Gutbrod, *"Weihnachtsgeschichten"*, 38-39; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 35-36; T. Stramare, "Giuseppe 'uomo giusto' in Mt. 1,18-25," *RivB* 287-300, 293-297; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 166-172; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 245-246 and 251; A. Salas, *La infancia de Jesús (Mt 1-2) ¿historia o teología?* (Madrid, 1976) 214-216.
For criticism, cf. P. Barbagli, "'Joseph, fili David, noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam' (Mt 1,20)," in *Maria in Sacra Scriptura* IV (Rome, 1967) 445-463, 453-460; Räisänen, *Die Mutter Jesu*, 62 n. 3; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 102; I. Broer, *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 252-253; A. Vicent Cernuda, *Bib* 55 (1974) 415; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 209; Brown, *Messiah*, 126.

3 Further in D. P. Senior, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew* (Leuven, 1975) 80-81 n. 3; L. Cope, "The Death of John the Baptist in the Gospel of Matthew; or, the Case of the Confusing Conjunction," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 515-519; Meier, *Law and History*, 47, 108, 124.

4 The difficulty of giving a precise meaning to the most common particles is compounded by their polyvalent use even in classical Greek. This is exemplified by the remarks on γάρ by J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954) 56-114. On p. 61 he remarks, "The connexion of thought is sometimes lacking in logical precision" (compare pp. 68-72). The Koine use of γάρ follows the fluid classical one; cf. BDF §452, pp. 235-236; and Meier in the preceding note.

A third difficulty is, that if Joseph had already been moved by reverential fear to retire from the scene, why did Matthew use the aorist subjunctive μὴ φοβηθῇς in 1:20b, which prohibits *future* fear.[1] The logical μὴ φοβοῦ could have been used, since it is found in plural form in 10:31, 14:27, 17:7, 28:5 and 10. The reason for employing the future imperative may be, that it was only *after* the message of the angel that Joseph could be struck by reverential fear. Hitherto he was ignorant of the divine genesis - 1:18b being addressed to the hearer or reader. If this be true, the angel forestalls his recoil from the mystery of the Spirit with μὴ φοβηθῇς: "You shall not hesitate to marry Mary." This normal translation would retain the theological richness of Léon-Dufour's hypothesis, while rejecting his interpretation of Joseph's earlier contemplation - and decision - of divorce. In this light, Joseph originally was reluctant to legitimate the child of his betrothed, and had resolved not to conclude the marriage process. But when the angel revealed the divine origin of the pregnancy, the reaction of Joseph was that of Isaiah before the All Holy, and of Elizabeth, the centurion, and Peter before their Lord. In conclusion, it should be noted that Léon-Dufour's theory explicitly aims at reconciling Joseph's fidelity to the Law with his mercy. But the foregoing examination of the late Jewish and Matthean notions of righteousness showed that these were not opposed. There is consequently no need to seek a subtle meaning in Matthew 1:20 in order to "justify" Joseph.

The last five pages have probed the participatory christology reflected in the righteousness of Joseph. A second aspect of this salvific impact of the Messiah is his essential involvement with "his people" manifested by his two God-given names - Jesus in verse 21 and Emmanuel in verse 23.

All redemption is ascribed to Jesus because this role is divinely ordained according to Psalm 130:8, echoed in the words of the angel. Matthew alone states that John baptized merely unto repentance (3:11), not salvation.[2] Consistently in his work salvation is attributed to Jesus. In contrast to the "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" of Mark and Luke,

---

1 Explanations hitherto offered are not compelling, viz., Stramare, "'uomo giusto'," 289; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 238, 240; Brown, *Messiah*, 129.

2 See Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 32; Wink, *John the Baptist*, 36; H. Thyen, "Βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν," *Zeit und Geschichte* (ed. E. Dinkler), 97-125, 102-103. Contrast Mt 3:2 with Mk 1:4 and Lk 3:3.

forgiveness is centred on Jesus in Matthew 9:3. The closing chorus of wonder, common to all the Synoptics, is expanded into, "They glorified God, *who had given such authority to men*" (9:8). Thereby is insinuated the covenant christology of the sharing of this healing power with the Church, which is described in 16:19 and 18:18. Secondly, Matthew 20:28 agrees with Mark 10:45 that the passion of Jesus is redemptive. But there is christological consistency in the fact that Matthew 20:22-23 (cf. 3:2) differs from Mark 10:38-39 and Luke 12:50 in not comparing redemption from sin to baptism. According to Matthew 3:12 (and parallels) and 28:19 baptism is the rite of the Spirit and discipleship. But it is not redemptive. Jesus is. This is explicit, thirdly, in 26:68 - "This is the blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins."[1]

The experience of reconciliation means that at last, in truth, "God is with us!"[2] "Emmanuel" is the acclamation of all the redeemed (καλέσουσιν, 1:23) - "his people" freed from "their" sins (1:21). Emmanuel denotes a saving presence which is a dynamic of the whole First Gospel.[3] The risen Son is always available to "disciples" (28:16 and 20). His presence is felt in time of stress: when a "brother" (18:15) sins, Jesus is there among the two or three who intercede (18:20); when the least of his "brothers" is suffering, the King is with them (25:40); when evangelization becomes daunting to his "brothers," Jesus is there - "every day" (28:10, 20). The paschal relationship to his brothers combats defective faith: 18:15-16 and 20 (?); 25:44-46; 28:17. In Matthew the Jesus of Palestine anticipates this Easter care for vacillating brethren. The disciples (14:26) of little

---

1 In Judaism and Qumran salvation from sin is effected by God, and not by the Messiah; cf. H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966) 1. 7-8. That mankind is saved from sin through Jesus the Christ is without precedent. Further in J. Michl, "Sündenvergebung in Christus nach dem Glauben der frühen Kirche," *MTZ* 24 (1973) 25-35; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 18, 216.

2 Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 13: "Für Matthäus ist aber ‚heilmachen' (von den Sünden) identisch mit dem Sein Gottes mit dem Menschen."

3 P. Christian (*Jesus*, 37-47) analyzes the possible OT, intertestamental, NT, and rabbinical background. On pp. 49-50 he is eloquent about how "God with us" is "*die Mitte dieses Evangeliums*" from the point of view of christology, ecclesiology, soteriology, and ethics. Compare Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 52-53, 96. "Mitsein" in Mt is examined at length by J. Lange, *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Mattäus* (Würzburg, 1973) 329-348; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 7-83(143), esp. pp. 12-21.

faith (v. 31) in the storm-tossed boat worship him who has come to them over the waves, and stilled the sea, as the "Son of God" (v. 33; compare ἐγώ εἰμι in v. 27, Mark 6:50, John 6:20). While he is "with" those of little faith he heals (17:17-20). Lastly, Matthew intensifies the communion of Jesus "with" (μετά) his own during the great trial of the Passion, e.g., 26:29, 36, 38, 40, 51, 71.[1] This paracletic presence supports a faith that wavers in the face of hardship or hostility.[2] Indeed, the *per crucem ad lucem* sequence of Matthew 1-2 and 27-28 is found in the original Emmanuel context, Isaiah 7-9.[3] In the Gospel of the Origins God the Father ("El," ὁ θεός) is present to Joseph and the magi through his angel and his Son, so that, despite quandary (1:19) and opposition from Jerusalem, they may bring his word to fruition - 1:23; 2:6, 15, 18, 23. By way of conclusion, it may be said that whereas Paul speaks of "the brother for whom Christ died" (1 Corinthians 8:11), Matthew talks of the brother for whom Christ lives. But the evangelist would concur with the apostle's description of his experience that "as we share abundantly in Christ's sufferings, so through Christ we share abundantly in comfort too" (2 Corinthians 1:5).[4]

Conclusion. - The literary and theological impress of Matthew is evident in 1:18-25. The keynote of the pericope, as so far examined, is the fulfilment of the will of the Lord in many ways. Joseph demonstrates that Matthean righteousness which infuses mercy into fidelity to the Law and the Prophets (1:19). Possibly his determination to repudiate his betrothed reflects the Gospel's stern attitude to πορνεία, based on the will of the

---

1 See Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 335-336; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 56. Another technique to associate (John and) the disciples to Jesus is to apply the same phrase to each: 3:2/4:17/10:7; 3:7/12:34/23:33; 3:10/7:19/ cf. 15:13; 4:23 and 9:35 (Jesus) and 10:1, 7-8 (the Twelve); 10:6/15:24; 10:24-25, etc. Further, Held, *Tradition and Redaction*, 176-177; Strecker, *Weg*, 220-222, 256; Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 82-83; Geist, as in n. 5 on p. 117, esp. pp. 124-125.

2 In both Mt 1:19-23 and 28:17-20 the promise of the divine presence is part of the customary OT reassurance; cf. Hubbard, *Primitive Apostolic Commissioning*, 64-65, 96-97; K. Smyth, "Resurrection as Theophany," *ITQ* 42 (1975) 259-271, 268-271.

3 Compare Brown, *Messiah*, 212, 214, and p. 105 (with p. 107 above).

4 Obviously there is a close connection between the *Kyrios* identifying Jesus as his Son in 1:22-23a, and the saving presence of God in v. 23b. But consideration of this must be postponed till Chapter 7, pp. 222-224.

Lord in Deuteronomy 24:1-4. The sacral angel of the Lord presides over the genesis of Jesus by the work of the holy spirit. This genesis actualizes Isaiah 7:14, which in turn commands the triple obedience of Joseph in verses 24-25. The angel interprets "Jesus" as destined to aggregate to himself a redeemed people. Such is the plan of God according to Psalm 130: 8, and Matthew respects it throughout his work, particularly by denying a salvific efficacy to the baptism of John, and attributing it to Jesus and his people. "Emmanuel" guarantees the helping presence of God to the brothers and disciples who must undergo trial. The covenant christology of the pericope is resolutely theocentric: the Lord God initiates redemption, according to his word and in his Son. Yet this word and this Son require a receptive community. The Gospel narrative christology involves man, and demands his clear-eyed obedience through bad times and good.

C. MATTHEW 2:1-12 - HIS OWN RECEIVED HIM NOT

At Jerusalem neither the king nor the guardians of the Law and the Prophets, the chief priests and scribes of the people, welcome the Christ. But at Bethlehem heathens, instructed by the scriptures and guided by the royal star, worship the Messiah of the Jews and Gentiles, and are protected by the Lord from the wiles of Jerusalem, bypassed on their journey home.[1]

Almost every verse of Matthew's second chapter has his favourite initial participle or participial construction. There are twenty-three instances in as many verses, of which the most striking are the three aorist genitive absolutes followed by ἰδού. These introduce the main divisions at verses 1, 13, 19. The generally redundant ἐγερθείς (1:24; 2:13-14, 20-21) and ἐλθών (2:8-9, 23) are typical. In the magi episode is found a number of specifically Matthean terms, which repay examination.

The First Gospel alone in the New Testament speaks of "coming to worship" (2:2, 8, 11). Προσκυνέω implies adoration of the *Kyrios*, especially in the aorist. It is noteworthy, by contrast, how the homage paid by the representative of the unbelieving generation (17:14), or by the mocking

---

1 The opposition between messianic Bethlehem and malevolent Jerusalem, and the ambivalence regarding "king" and "worship," have been mentioned on p. 39. The vocabulary of Mt 2 is studied word by word for the evangelist's traits by Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 49-56. See further, Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 236-241, and his "Matthew's Vocabulary" on pp. 476-485; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 180-189, 210-216, 219-228, 253-300 (with references to C. T. Davis); Brown, *Messiah*, 109, 192, and "Notes" passim.

soldiers (27:29) is expressed by γονυπετέω. Therefore Matthew 2:2 and 11 depict the adoration of faith, in contrast to the malevolent hypocrisy of Herod in verse 8. Such feigned piety anticipates the diatribe of 7:21-23 and 23:29-37. "Falling down" (πίπτω) to pay obeisance (προσκυνέω) occurs seven times in the New Testament; but the sole evangelist to use the expression is Matthew at 2:11; 4:9; 18:26.[1]

The threatening overtone of the convocation of the Jerusalem establishment in verse 4 (συναγαγών) has been noted as an anticipation of the Passion.[2] A similar shade of meaning infuses ἀναχωρέω, ten of the fourteen New Testament uses of which are in Matthew. Eight times it describes the retreat of Jesus, or the magi, before hostility and unbelief: 2:12, 13, 14, 22; 4:12; 12:15; 14:13; 15:21. The two remaining occasions are analogous.[3] In 9:24 Jesus uses the verb to dismiss the crowd who mocked his implicit claim to raise from the dead. The despairing Judas "departed (ἀνεχώρησεν), and he went and hanged himself" (27:5).

Thus the magi scene deftly foreshadows the opposition between faith and worship (προσκυνέω) and unbelief and persecution (συνάγω, ἀναχωρέω) that permeates the whole Gospel. Having detected this intention, it may reasonably be surmised that Matthew heightened the contrast between the king in unbelieving Jerusalem and the king in Davidic Bethlehem, e.g., by describing Herod as "king" in verses 1 and 3 in contrast to "David *the* king" of 1:6, "king of the Jews" in verse 2, the Christ (v. 4), the good shepherd ἡγούμενος (v.6), and the obeisance and royal gifts of the sages (v. 11). Secondly, the stress on royal Judah and Judaea in 2:1, 5, 6(*bis*), 22, may reflect the legitimacy of Jesus' Davidic claims over against the usurping Idumean, Herod. To judge from the fact that Matthew alone of the evangelists likes the expression γῆ followed by a placename in the genitive,

---

1 On προσκυνέω in Mt see Gomá Civit, *Mateo*, 65-66; R. Pesch, *Bib* 48 (1967) 414-415; F. Neirynck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la rédaction matthéenne (Matt. XXVIII.1-10)," *NTS* 15 (1968/69) 168-190, 178-180; Thompson, *Matthew's Advice*, 54-55, 214-215 and n. 62; Sabourin, *Matteo*, 232-233; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 273-274, 287-288; Moule, *Origin*, 175-176.

2 See p. 88, with n. 1.

3 Despite the reservations of Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 124-126. See also the interesting note of Fenton, *Matthew*, 48; and the speculations of B. Gerhardsson, "Jésus livré et abandonné d'après la Passion selon Saint Matthieu," *RB* 76 (1969) 206-227, 216-217 n. 11.

the insertion of γῆ Ἰούδα into the quotation in 2:6 is a further instance of his Davidic cachet.[1] The solidarity of Jerusalem with Herod's dismay in 2:3 is echoed in the city's commotion at the entry of Jesus in 21:10, where, however, a different verb is used. The collective hostility of the capital is voiced again: "They all said, 'Let him be crucified'" (27:22); and, "All the people answered, 'His blood be on us'" (27:25).[2]

Hitherto the blindness and hostility of the ruling classes have been noted. A counterbalancing Matthean motif is the acceptance of the Gentiles into "my people Israel" (2:6).[3] Since Jesus was sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, his work for the heathens is not developed. Part of the obscurity surrounding this subject probably arises from the evangelist's inchoate articulation of the relationship to Judaism of what later came to be known as Christianity.[4] Matthew felt himself very much a son of Israel, yet faith in the Christ, not natural sonship of Abraham (3:9), was the sole criterion for being a disciple in his *ekklēsia*. He understands Jesus the Christ as effecting a regrouping within the people of the covenants. He does not yet seem able to visualize this regrouping as the true Israel.[5] Despite the fact that Matthew never speaks of the disciples constituting the "Israel of the Messiah," this is an adequate term for his embryonic ecclesiology. It has the advantage of insisting that "my people

---

1 See p. 118, and Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 262-263.

2 Noting the allusions of Mt 27 to Deut 21:1-9, 27:9, 15-26, Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 207-210) sees here the curse afflicting the covenant breaker.

3 Cf. n. 1 on p. 95; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 108-119. Both Frankemölle (pp. 199-200) and Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 266) correctly indicate the Davidic setting of "my people Israel," but wrongly confine it to the empiric OT Israel in the light of 2:4. The messianic theme links it with "his people" of 1:21. Cf. Brown, *Messiah*, 175.

4 Compare pp. 95-96.

5 See p. 96, with n. 2. Although first century Christians saw allegiance to the Christ as distinguishing disciples from Jews, they tolerated a wide range of doctrine and practice; cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the Early Church* (NT Library; London: SCM, 1977). The same reluctance to define, and thereby confine, too sharply the true Israel appears in the acceptance by the exclusivist Pharisees that the Sadducees and the *'amme ha-'arets* belonged to Israel. See further E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977) 147-157. Compare, "For Paul the Jewish people continue God's chosen people despite their rejection of the gospel" (W. D. Davies, "Paul and the People of Israel," *NTS* 24 [1977/78] 4-39, at p. 28).

Israel" is composed only of those who are subject to Jesus the Christ, in and through whom the Law and the Prophets are achieving their full power and reality. The continuity between the old and the new economy is not seen by Matthew in the community, but in the Messiah.[1] It was only after the time of Matthew, when Jesus came to be identified explicitly as Israel, that the Church could be dubbed the "true Israel." As far as is known, it was Justin who first called Jesus "Israel," and the Church the "true Israel."[2]

Matthew's three mentions of believing pagans depict them as taking the initiative, and coming to Jesus in faith: the magi, the centurion, and the Canaanite woman (compare "Syria" in 4:24, and probably 15:29-31). This flocking of the Gentiles to the Kingdom of Heaven is graphically described: "Many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (8:11). The evangelist's notion of the Gentile mission during the ministry of Christ is centripetal.[3] The magi are all of a piece with this conception. The grandiose prophetic vision of the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion becomes reality. The gold, frankincense, and myrrh are gifts fit for the Son of David, and are deliberately reminiscent of the promised homage of the heathen. But if their gifts confirm the word of God, their faith anticipates the ingathering of the Gentiles.[4]

---

1 Compare Hare, *Jewish Persecution*, 160, 170; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 31-38.

2 Justin could identify the Church with the true Israel because he identified both with the Messiah; see Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 205-206.

3 Compare and contrast Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 141-142, also pp. 104-105, 137-138; and D. Zeller, "Das Logion Mt 8,11f/Lk 13,28f und das Motiv der 'Völkerwallfahrt'," *BZ* 15 (1971) 222-237; 16 (1972) 84-93, with the additional note (on the dependence on Isa 43:3-7) of W. Grimm, "Zum Hintergrund von Mt 8,11f/Lk 13,28f," *BZ* 16 (1972) 255-256; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 342-345.

4 In the life of the first century Church the gifts of the magi had their counterpart in the funds sent to Jerusalem by the diaspora Pauline churches, which showed the sincerity of their conversion and brotherhood; cf. K. Berger, "Almosen für Israel: Zum Historischen Kontext der Paulinischen Kollekte," *NTS* 23 (1976/77) 180-204, 192, 200, 204. But if Mt had intended a reminiscence of these gifts, he would surely have included some of the key terms of the magi episode in his (unparalleled) account of Jesus paying the Temple tax, and the paying of tribute by foreigners (17:24-27).

D. MATTHEW 2:13-23 - THE SON OF MAN HAS NOWHERE TO LAY HIS HEAD

The covenant christology of 1:1-2:12 continues to be expressed by the fidelity of God in his Son (2:15, 17-18, 23), calling for the obedience of man (2:13-14, 19-22). The ecclesial significance of the Christ is also conveyed through the Bethlehem infants and the children of Rachel. Even his journeys may possibly have some deeper meaning for his followers. Consequently, Matthew 2:16-18 will first be examined, and afterwards the migrations to Egypt and Nazareth of Galilee will be studied.

1) *A Praising and Persecuted People (Jeremiah 31:15)*

In six of the eight verses in Matthew where παῖς appears, it means servant. But only in 2:16 and 21:15 does it signify "child." The contexts are parallel. In Matthew 2 and 21:1-16, the messianic Son of David from Nazareth in Galilee is honoured by "outsiders" (magi, children/θηλαζόντες); and both he and they are menaced by Jerusalem authorities, as scripture is fulfilled in the role of the children - Jeremiah 31:15 and Psalm 8:2(3).[1] Consequently, it is permissible to view the children of 2:16 and 21:15-16 as representing Matthew's meek and lowly babes (11:25-30, νήπιοι), his little ones (10:42; 18:6-14, μικροι), and his παιδία (18:2-5; 19:13-14).[2] Perhaps the evangelist draws on the early Jewish belief that the nurslings, who escaped the Pharaonic pogrom through the faith of their mothers, recognized God their Father and nourisher at the defeat of the Egyptians in the Reed Sea. From the breasts of their mothers (Matthew 2:16b and 21:16b!) they made signs to their fathers, and then told them about their Father. At this the Israelites praised God.[3] In celebrating the Feast of the Holy Innocents, the first witnesses to the Christ of the lowly, the Church has apparently absorbed into her life a basic thrust of the gospel text.

---

1 Mt 21:10-16 is compared with 2:1-6, 16 by Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 156-157, 255-256; and Davis, "Tradition and Redaction," 415-417. Neither associates the children of 2:16 with those of 21:15-16. But to the similarity of content noted above between Mt 2 and 21:1-16 may be added that of form: 21:4-5, fulfilment formula quotation; 21:6-7, obedience formula; 21:14-16, same structure as 2:1-6 - Circumstances/Reaction/Question/Answer from OT. See also above p. 115 n. 1.

2 See Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 306; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 270 (on Mt 21:15-16).

3 *Exod. Rab.* 1:12; 15:1(23:8); *Tg. Neof.* Ex 15:2 Margin. See Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Éxodo*, 96 (with reference to P. Winter); and E. B. Levine in Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Levítico*, 443, at Ex 15:2.

The evangelist makes it quite clear, however, that there is no crown without a cross. That mourner for Jerusalem, Jeremiah, is twice invoked by Matthew, in contrast to his frequent recourse to Isaiah, his prophet of weal. Jeremiah gives the divine view of Herod's slaughter of the infants in the messianic city (2:18), and of the chief priests' purchase with Judas' blood money of a burial ground, whose name Hakeldama perpetuates their responsibility for the death of the Messiah (27:6-10). Significantly, it is only on these two occasions that the customary purposive ἵνα or ὅπως of the introductory formula is replaced by the simple observation, τότε ἐπληρώθη - 2:17 and 27:9. The twin alteration indicates that the unrighteous activity of Jerusalem is permitted by Yahweh, but not carried out by him in Jesus as in the other fulfilment formula quotations.[1]

At the outset it may be stated that no exegete has satisfactorily elucidated Matthew's intention in 2:18.[2] The majority is content to give technical details, such as the text form, the location(s) of Rachel's tomb, and the original meaning of Rachel-Israel mourning for her children being led into exile.[3] Others go to the opposite extreme. They detect the exodus of Moses and the exile of Israel repeated in the career of Christ.[4]

---

1 See Strecker, *Weg*, 59 n. 5; Pesch, "Gottessohn," 399 n. 3; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 85; Senior, *Passion Narrative*, 368-369 (with reference to W. Rothfuchs); Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 233-234; Green, *Matthew*, 151, 219; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 50-51, 54; Brown, *Messiah*, 205.

2 Compare Goulder (*Midrash and Lection*, 239): "Now of all the citations in the Gospel, this is the most clearly artificial"; Soares Prabhu (*Formula Quotations*, 253): "The formula quotation of Mt 2,17f is surely among the most problematic of all those in Mt's Gospel."

3 E.g., the commentaries on Mt - Allen, 16; M'Neile, 20; Lagrange, 34-36; Schmid, 73; Fenton, 49; Gomá Civit, 73; Grundmann, 85-86; Bonnard, 29; Albright and Mann, 19; Hill, 86; Schweizer, 21; Sabourin, 237; and studies such as, Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 43, 71; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance*, 159-161; Gutbrod, *"Weihnachtsgeschichten"*, 49; Brown, *Messiah*, 205-206, 216-217, 221-223.

4 Cf. Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 29-31; Hartman, "Scriptural Exegesis," 137-141, 152. Hartman traces an impressive, but very fragile, web of relationships between 2:18 and 2:1-16: Ramah evokes Bethlehem (2:5-6), and Jer 31:15 in its context looks to the future of Zion (Mt 2:11) and the beloved son (2:15). Probably Maldonatus is closer to Mt's mind in observing that the mother of Benjamin mourns for Jerusalem, situated in her son's tribal land. One may add that as mother of Joseph also Rachel can pity all Israel and this Davidic Joseph. See *Joannis Maldonati Commentarii in Quattuor Evangelistas* (curavit Conradus Martin; 2d ed.; Moguntiae/Londini/Parisiis: Sumptibus Francisci Kirchhemii, 1853), 1. 41.

The wide sweep and generous contours of such an exegesis are attractive, but vague and impressionistic. Elsewhere Matthew's quotations are relatively straightforward, even if he does draw on a wealth of intertwined traditions, and often weaves the narrative around the cited text. A third direction is the exploration of the contemporary Jewish understanding of Jeremiah 31:15 and its context. The interest in Rachel or Ephraim[1] is promising, but the meagreness of the source material forbids firm conclusions. More tangible evidence comes from an examination of the quotation in its original and its New Testament contexts. Jeremiah 31 is a prime text of the first century Church.[2] The chapter does mourn for the diaspora, but only in the single verse cited by Matthew! The other thirty-nine verses proclaim the return of Israel ("Ephraim, my first-born, my dear son," in 31:1-4, 16-22) and of Judah (23-30), a new covenant with both kingdoms (31-34), and the divine pledge of unfailing support for Israel and the restoration of Jerusalem (35-40).[3] The sorrow is turned into joy, as it will be at the very end of the First Gospel.[4]

The wisdom of hindsight, which with Jeremiah's aid discerns in Matthew 2:16-18 a later malevolence of Jerusalem and triumph over persecution, makes sense of that experience of resistance to the infant Church. The whole of Matthew 2 is preoccupied with the infidelity and rejection of

---

1 Very briefly on Rachel, and without references, in Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 42. For Ephraim see Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 29 with n. 3; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 257.

2 Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures. The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (Fontana Books; London: Collins, 1965 [1st published 1952]) 44-46, 85-86.

3 "This would be another example of the rabbinic style in which the purpose of the quotation is to be found in the succeeding phrases to which the words actually quoted have been a pointer" (B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic. The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* [London: SCM, 1961] 218). Lindars believes that the Church, if not Matthew, was aware of the original context of hope.

4 Developments on the influence of Jer 31 on Mt 2 are found in J. Riedl, *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu. Die Heilsbotschaft von Mt 1-2 und Lk 1-2* (Biblisches Forum 3; Stuttgart: KBW, 1968) 44; Gundry, *Use of OT in Matthew*, 210; Hill, *Matthew*, 86; Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, LXIII, cf. pp. 21-22; P. Benoit in Benoit & M.-E. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre évangiles en français* (Paris: Cerf, 1972), 2. 66 §16. - Note Jer 31:8-12 (Hebrew): "The blind and the lame . . . shall sing aloud on the height of Zion," and 31[38]:8LXX: "for the feast of Passover." If this is echoed in Mt 21:14-15, the παῖδες of 21:15 may correspond to those of 2:16 (p. 135).

official Israel. When the united front of Herod and Jerusalem (2:3 and the plural in 2:20) tries to eliminate the Son of David, it seals its own fate. In the text of Jeremiah 31:15 quoted in Matthew 2:18 τέκνα means descendants. The word differs from the united Septuagint tradition of υἱοί at verse 15 (but note τέκνα in 17). Therefore, it may be the choice of the evangelist himself, who uses the term fourteen times in all. Both he and Luke apply it to the unworthy children of Abraham (3:9) or Jerusalem (23:37). Twice elsewhere Matthew uses it in similar fashion - the parable of the two sons (21:28-32), and the acceptance of possible blood-guilt by two generations of Jerusalemites (27:25; compare 18:25). Consequently, it is reasonable to propose that at 2:18 the evangelist presents the mother of Joseph and matriarch lamenting the searing unbelief of many of her τέκνα towards the Christ, as well as the suffering of other innocent τέκνα. This transition from empiric Israel to "his people" (1:21) is thematic, and comes to a chilling climax in 27:25 - "His blood be on us and on our τέκνα."[1] Such was to be the response of Jerusalem to the King of Israel. Matthew anticipated it from the outset. He comments on the pogrom against the Davidids in the words of Jeremiah 31:15, which he takes as referring to both sides of the great division in the people of the prophets. The righteous of the present suffer, the disciples. That is obvious. But the righteous of the past also suffer - even Rachel. Throughout his Gospel, by quotation or reminiscence of scripture, Matthew aims at demonstrating how the messianic present flows out of the religious past. But at the death of Jesus he ceases to cite scripture. The reality has arrived. "After the resurrection" of the Christ the first to benefit are the "saints" whom the old covenant had nurtured. They enter "the holy city," the new Jerusalem (27:52-53). Next to enter the Kingdom are the Gentile centurion and his men (27:54). Here in Matthew 2 the mourning Rachel and the Gentile magi anticipate the dead saints and legionaries. The matriarch bewails the double-edged sword that passes through Israel. It cuts off the just by death, and the unbelievers by judgment. Yet Rachel, who mourns for both persecuted and persecutors, will have new children, the people saved by Jesus.

---

1 Compare n. 1 on p. 106; Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn*, 69-70; Green, *Matthew*, 60, 221. Contrast Brown, *Messiah*, 222. See further, Senior, *Passion Narrative*, 255-261.

Viewed, therefore, in the light of Matthew's ecclesiological interests, the infants of 2:16 are plausibly the forerunners of the praising child-disciples of 21:15-16, who are offensive to the Temple establishment; while the slain τέκνα of 2:18 anticipate the unbelief that would decimate Jerusalem (27:25; cf. 24:19), and which dealt so heavy a blow to the lover of Israel and of the people of Jesus. In the light of the *Unheilsgeschichte* of Jeremiah, it was essential to the mystery of divine salvation that the child should be set for the fall and rising of many in Israel.[1]

2) *A Catholic People (Matthew 2:22)*

In the course of a pericope showing heavy Matthean editing, 21:1-16, the evangelist is alone in giving the crowd's estimation of Christ: "This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee" (verse 11). This identification is grounded in 2:22-23. The arrival at Nazareth is the first of Jesus' three "comings" in Matthew, each of which delights a prophet: 2:23; 4:14-16; 21:4-5. Unlike Mark and Luke, he telescopes the retirement to Galilee after the imprisonment of John, and the move from Nazareth to Capernaum. Thereby he achieves greater emphasis for the migration. Both changes of residence are aligned by the employment of exactly the same phraseology in 2:22-23 and 4:12-13 (compare 14:13):

ἀκούσας δε . . . ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας | τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
καὶ . . . ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς . . . Ναζαρέθ | Καφαρναούμ

Matthew illumines each Galilean town with the aureole of prophecy. He alone is so explicit about the messianic transformation of Galilee. Ernst Lohmeyer's overstatement of the case for Galilee being the choice locale of revelation has perhaps stunted the appreciation of the geographico-theological symbolism of Galilee and Jerusalem.[2] It may be accepted as

---

1 Mt 2:16-18 is here explained in the light of the Jerusalem ministry, Mt 21-27. Both Matthean quotations from Jeremiah are associated with places in the Jerusalem neighbourhood, Ramah (2:18) and Hakeldama (27:8-9). The current Arabic names for tombs in the Ramah/Anathoth complex include, "The Tombs of the Sons of Israel" and "The Tomb of the Mother of the Sons of Israel." On the basis of *Jub.* 32:34 and *T. Jos.* 20:3, these names are thought to be pre-Christian by G. Lombardi, *La Tomba di Rahel: Ḫ. Farah - W. Farah presso Anatot* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1971) 94-98. Could they have suggested to Mt an interpretation of Jer 31:15, whereby the children of Israel draw down death on themselves?

2 Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (FRLANT 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1936).

axiomatic that the first Christians were not divorced from history and geography. The cultural, and even familial, roots in Galilee and Judaea (and Samaria?) must a priori have had an influence in shaping the earliest understanding and expression of their faith in the Christ. He came from Galilee. Origins specify essence in a society where a man often goes not by his own name, but by that of his father (the son of Jesse), or in association with his home town (Jesus of Nazareth). Therefore, Galilee (and Nazareth and Capernaum) must have significance in the plan of Yahweh.[1] It is from there that the Saviour's fame "spread throughout all Syria" (4:24). There, too, the centurion came to believe (8:8-12); and he proclaimed justice to the Gentiles (12:15-18). By the sea of Galilee the outcast "glorified the God of Israel" (15:29-31). The revelation of the Christ the Son of the living God by the Father to Peter takes place in greater Galilee (16:13-17). The *ekklesia* there promised (16:18-19) is given its characteristic form before Jesus "went away from Galilee" (19:1, following the community discourse of chapter 18). The prophet from Nazareth of Galilee relives the confrontation with Jerusalem of Matthew 2 in 21:10-16. Lastly, the mystic mountain in Galilee is the locus of the coming of the Kingdom in word (5:1), proleptically in the person of Jesus transfigured (17:1), and universally in the mission of the disciples (28:16). Galilee, therefore, powerfully conveys the basic antithesis of the Gospel. It legitimates the interior exile within Israel of its Messiah, and shows how God had always

---

1 The most systematic critique of Lohmeyer's (and W. Marxsen's) theory about Galilee in Mk as the place of revelation and the parousia is that by Günter Stemberger in Davies, *Gospel and Land*, "Appendix IV: Galilee - Land of Salvation?," pp. 409-438. He pays little attention to Mt, and displays no acquaintance with the opposing views of H. Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission* (BEvT 55; München: Christus Kaiser, 1969) 89-95; van Cangh, "Galilée dans Marc." One can agree with Stemberger that little is known of first century Galilean Christianity (p. 425), and that the emphasis of Mt and Mk on Galilee reflects Jesus' actual ministry to the despised and lowly of this poorly regarded northern province (p. 436). W. D. Davies (*Gospel and Land*, 241) is right in holding, "There is no Galilean idyll for Jesus in Mark or Matthew. For them both Galilee found much to object to in Jesus, as he found much to condemn in it." Nevertheless, Galilee clearly has a symbolic, and consequently vital, import for Mk as J.-M. van Cangh has demonstrated. Compare J. Radermakers, *La bonne nouvelle de Jésus selon saint Marc. 2. Lecture continue* (Bruxelles: Editions "Institut d'Etudes Théologiques," 1974) 75-76; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 111-113.
See also p. 34 n. 1, and p. 91, above; and the following note.

intended to upset human calculations by incorporating the humble, the outcast, and the heathen into his church. In sum, Matthew's "apocalypse" of Jesus the Christ is associated with the slighted Galilee of the Gentiles.[1] The people of Jesus is of its nature catholic, both horizontally since it welcomes the whole world, and vertically because it attracts disciples from all strata of society and fulfils the promises of God.

The migrations of Jesus throughout the Gospel have been very tentatively linked to Matthew 2 by Eduard Schweizer.[2] The Syrian church held the travelling prophets and teachers in high esteem, as is evidenced by the *Didache*, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the pseudo-Clementine letter *De virginitate*. "The wandering of these prophets certainly was connected with the theology of the pilgrim, whose prototype was Jesus in his earthly life."[3] Matthew's community would seem to have been a forerunner of this spirituality, and it knew itinerant prophets and charismatic healers and exorcists.[4] Schweizer concludes that it is at least not impossible that the homeless Jesus of Matthew 2 is proposed as a model for later travelling holy men. This is a tempting redactional interpretation, but the motive

---

1 On theological Galilee in Mt see particularly Lange, *Das Erscheinen*, 358-385 (also pp. 386-391 on Galilee and Jerusalem, and pp. 392-446 on the mountain in Mt). See also the commentaries on Mt, e.g., Albright and Mann, 359, 361; Radermakers, 74 ("le symbole du rassemblement universel"); Green, 138, 148; Sabourin, 332-333; Gomá Civit, 2. 700-701; and Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 130-131 n. 50 (Galilee is the *Kernprovinz* of the Messiah and almost synonymous with Israel in 4:23-9:5); Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 110 n. 41 (haggadic midrash on placenames in Mt 2); Green, *Matthew*, 56-57; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 134. Isa 8:23-9:1 provides "the structural backbone" of Mt according to W. R. Farmer, "Jesus and the Gospels: A Form-critical and Theological Essay," *PSTJ* 28 (1975) 1-62, 43-45.

2 "Observance of the Law," 221-222, 229 n. 1; *Matthäus*, 22, 117, 131; "Zur Struktur der hinter dem Matthäusevangelium stehendem Gemeinde," *ZNW* 65 (1974) 139; "The 'Matthean' Church," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 216; and p. 93 n. 2.

3 H. Koester, "*GNŌMAI DIAPHORAI*. The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," *HTR* 58 (1965) 279-318, 288. Cf. further R. Murray, "The Exhortation to Candidates for Ascetical Vows at Baptism in the Ancient Syriac Church," *NTS* 21 (1974/75) 59-80, 59-60, 75, 79; G. Theissen, *The First Followers of Jesus. A Sociological Analysis of earliest Christianity* (London: SCM, 1978) 7-36, with the articles cited in nn. 6 and 11 on p. 121.

4 Schweizer, "Observance of the Law," 226-229. Compare Stanton, "Matthean Christianity," 80-83. É. Cothenet ("Les prophètes chrétiens," 291) is sceptical about Schweizer's comparison of Jesus to an itinerant prophet such as those familiar to Mt's community.

for the flight of Joseph with the child and its mother is patently one of fear, not of service. Jesus' retirement to Capernaum after the arrest of John (4:12-13), and his shifting of attention from the crowds to the disciples after John's execution (14;13ff.), and even the post-resurrection migration from hostile Jerusalem to Galilee (26:32; 28:7, 10, 16), are closer parallels.[1] The opposition encountered by the early disciples, their consignment to benighted Galilee, and the scandalous catholic outreach of their ministry, make them, like Jesus, strangers and pilgrims on the earth. They have nowhere to lay their head.

Summary and Concluding Considerations. - The foregoing partial consideration of the christology of the two opening chapters of the First Gospel focussed on the religious matrix of the Messiah: Yahweh and his saving plan, and Israel according to the Spirit and according to the flesh. The evangelical participatory christology means that the soteriological and ecclesiological resonance of Jesus requires attention. Matthew 1-2 were treated in four sections, in each of which the recourse to scripture revealed the triumph of the familiar and overriding purpose of God.

Firstly, the prose poem of the genealogy hymned the loyalty of Yahweh to his covenant. The suffering brothers of 1:11 anticipate those of later decades. The four Gentile ancestresses prepare for the ingathering of the nations. All five women manifest God drawing straight with crooked lines - the overcoming of all obstacles to his grace in an unexpected, not to say disconcerting, fashion.

Secondly, the righteousness of Joseph, so concerned to ally mercy with justice, so sensitive to the triple command of the Lord through Isaiah,

---

1 Mt frequently notes the withdrawal of Jesus; see pp. 132 and 139 (joined to κατοικέω in 2:23 and 4:13). The fourfold μετοικεσία of the genealogy (1:11-12, 17) may also come from him, prompted perhaps by the exile as a turning point in 1 Chr 3:17; 5:22; 9:1. Goulder (*Midrash and Lection*, 233), however, exaggerates in proposing that the exile dominates the end of Mt through frequent allusions to the prophets of the captivity and return - Jeremiah, Zechariah, Daniel.

A fundamental aspect of the Mt 2 placenames is caught by the reflection of Brown (*Messiah*, 217) on the three formula quotations 2:6, 15, 18, which "by mentioning *Bethlehem*, the city of David, *Egypt*, the Land of the Exodus, and *Ramah*, the mourning-place of the Exile, offer a theological history of Israel in geographical miniature. Just as Jesus sums up the history of the people named in his genealogy, so his early history sums up the history of these prophetically significant places."

is a timeless paradigm. The essential names of the Christ bespeak a redeemed people ("Jesus"), who rejoice in the support of God's presence, whatever may befall ("Emmanuel").

Thirdly, the celestial summoning of the magi underscores the illegitimate kingship of Herod and the blindness of Jerusalem. This is a consolation to believers who lay claim to the right understanding of the Word of the Lord, and are at odds with the authorities. The homage of the Gentiles and the saving of the remnant of Israel (cf. 2:10-22) are a staple experience of Matthew's audience.

Finally, unpopular but clear-eyed Jeremiah had known from of old that God's praising people would be his persecuted people. The trauma occasioned in Israel by the conversion of the pagans, and the acceptance of the impure, could be assuaged by penetrating the prophetic counsels. But the people of the Messiah would be all too familiar with grief. Those of whom the world was not worthy were destined to wander.

The self-understanding of the corporate Christ in Matthew 1-2, therefore, includes its conviction that its commitment to Jesus makes it the inheritor of the divine promises, and the authoritative interpreter of scripture. The future is theirs, because the past is theirs. Moreover, because it is saved and buoyed up by the presence of the glorified Christ, it must be his righteous people, scrutinizing the Word of God to learn his will. The very fact of accepting the Messiah, and being made privy to the plan of Yahweh, entails the acceptance of the Gentiles and the outcast. Concomitantly, it brings ostracism, and even opposition from the Israel of the flesh. Such, in brief, is the more "subjective" dimension of the covenant christology of the Gospel of the Origins.

In guise of a conclusion, this self-understanding may be placed in a broader perspective. Any gospel christology is sensitive to the web of relationships which give messianic meaning and power to Jesus of Nazareth. It considers the Christ in the light of what anticipated him (the communion of Israel with Yahweh, and her hopes), of what accompanied him (his identity and work for "his people"), and of what followed him (the vitality, the mission, and the suffering of the Israel of the Messiah). As remarked on page 115 above, from the beginning Jesus was experienced on the same register as was God - both were personal, but more than individual.

First to be considered is the experience of the activity, the character,

of God in Jesus. William Temple astutely observed about christology, "The wise question is not, 'Is Christ Divine?,' but 'What is God like?'."[1] In the vicissitudes of the genealogy with its five chosen women, in the generation from the Spirit, in the scriptural quotations, in the appearance of the king's star to the worthy Gentiles, in the guidance and preservation of the infant Christ, Matthew sees what God is like. This is the climax of the pattern of Israel's depth experiences of Yahweh "abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness." He is loyal to his promises to Abraham and David, able and willing to make a new beginning and save from sin, true to his prophetic word, loving towards all men, and close to the upright in their trials. Matthew's christology is resolutely theocentric.

Secondly, the impact of the Christ, the refashioning of Israel, is delineated. Jesus is the fruition and focus of God's grace to Israel (1:1-17). Joseph is both the true Israelite and the first Christian: faithful to the will of the Father in the Torah, Isaiah, and the angel's words, yet merciful to Mary (1:18-25). Under the Davidic Christ messianic Israel embraces both Jew and Gentile, even at the expense of rupturing the Israel of popular estimation - yet all alike must know and obey the word of the Lord (2:1-12). Messianic Israel has to retire from Jerusalem in the face of unbelief, and meet its Lord in "Galilee" - *per crucem ad lucem* (2:13-23).

The Gospel of the Origins is of a piece with the rest of the work in being "profitable for correction and training in righteousness" (2 Timothy 3:16). The genealogy savours the sap-filled roots of the Church. Joseph and the magi produce the firstfruits of the *agapē* of the Nazarenes. The quotations strengthen the eyes and heart of faith. Even the primal Jerusalem misunderstanding of scripture and consequent hostility bear their consolation, and shed light on Calvary and the daily cross. Yahweh, Jerusalem, and the disciples interact in the career of the Christ. Now he is the *Hermeneutik* of the existence of Israel. Thus Matthew's participatory christology assimilates and illumines the earliest Christian experience of questioning by insiders, misunderstanding by outsiders, and the convulsion of traditional ways arising from the breaking of cultural moulds by the crucified and risen Christ, and the expansion of messianic Israel among the pagans.

---

1 In *Foundations. A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought* (ed. B. H. Streeter; London: Macmillan, 1912) 259.

CHAPTER 7

THE OBJECTIVE DIMENSION: THE ROYAL SON OF GOD

The analysis of Matthew's pre-baptism cycle in the previous chapter concentrated on the role of Yahweh and of Israel, both messianic and unbelieving. Here in Chapter Seven attention is focussed on the more "objective" element, the identity of the Christ. Any distinction implied by the titles of Chapters Six and Seven refers to a widespread contemporary understanding of christology. "Objective" and "subjective" are not distinct categories in the evangelist's covenant christology. In attempting to appreciate Matthew's experience of the identity of Jesus Christ, violence is not done to his organic and dynamic exposition by considering Jesus in the three interpenetrating dimensions which emerge in the two opening chapters: *Christ*, *Son of David*, and *Son of God*.

A. THE CHRIST THE SON OF DAVID

1) *The Christ in Matthew*

The term "Christ" is found relatively more frequently in Matthew (seventeen times) than in Mark (seven) or Luke (twelve). It is used as a title rather than a personal name.[1] Therefore, wherever it occurs a certain theological density is to be expected.[2]

---

1 Against Strecker, *Weg*, 126; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 112-113. With Blair, *Jesus in Mt*, 55; Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 222 n. 440; Fuller, *Foundations*, 192; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 52 n. 34, 128-129; Longenecker, *Christology*, 75; K. Berger, "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 391-425, 391-392; W. Grundmann, "Χρίω," *TDNT* 9 (1974) 493-580, 531 n. 265; and, to a degree, Senior, *Passion Narrative*, 239-240 n. 4; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 96-97.

2 Mt shares four occurrences with Mk (16:16; 22:42; 24:23; 26:63), and has six closely parallel to Mk (16:20, 21; 24:5; 26:68; 27:17, 22). Seven are peculiar to Mt, five of which are in Mt 1-2 (1:1, 16, 17, 18; 2:4; 11:2; 23:10). There are two main usages: ὁ Χριστός (11x) and Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χρίστος (3x). See also pp. 104-105 above.

As a prolegomenon to the investigation of the meaning of the title in Matthew, it is interesting to note that, whereas the demons recognized their exorcist as the Christ in Mark 1:34 (following the corrected Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Freerianus) and in Luke 4:41, the term is not in the very similar Matthew 8:16-17, where he prefers to cite Isaiah 53:4, 11. Elsewhere the evangelist associates the recognition of Jesus as the Son (of God) with divine, and not demonic, revelation - through the prophets in 1:22-23 and 2:15, or directly by a voice from heaven as in 3:17 and 17:5, or by internal revelation as in 11:25-27 and 16:16-17.[1] Perhaps the apparent denial of spiritual insight to the unclean spirits also reflects Matthew's condemnation of Satan's perverted knowledge of scripture in 4:6 (and Luke 4:10-11). Such misunderstanding, of course, implies blindness regarding the Christ (22:42-45, and even 2:3-6). Jesus' rebuke to Peter shows that Satan cannot comprehend that the Christ must suffer, because he is not a Messiah of this world, but the Christ of the living God (16:16, 23). Matthew here and elsewhere (12:18, 22-32) affirms the dichotomy between the Christ and Satan. It will later [2) b) (i)] appear how, as the Son of David, the Christ is master of the unclean spirits.

In Matthew's use of "Christ" three emphases may be discerned. Firstly, six of his thirteen unparalleled instances link the Messiah with salvation, that is, with "Jesus" - 1:1, 16, 18; 16:21; 27:17, 22. The combination "Jesus Christ" is not found outside Matthew in the Synoptics, with the probable exception of the title prefixed to the Gospel of Mark. The other two differ from Matthew in coupling "Jesus" with Son of David (contrast Matthew 9:27 and 20:30), and with Son of God (against Matthew 8:29). The pairing of Messiah and Saviour is not fortuitous. The evangelist is well aware of the functional significance of the name Jesus (1:21).[2]

There is ample evidence that Matthew was not the first to speak of the

---

1 An exception to this, at first glance, is the cry of the Gadarene demoniacs in the triple tradition at 8:29. Here "son of God" seems to be part of exorcism language. The exorcised do not believe in Mt.

2 On the early theology of the Name see Longenecker, *Christology*, 41-46 (with reference to J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* [London, 1964] 147-163). Also, J. Dupont, "Nom de Jésus," *DBSup* 6 (1960) 514-541; G. Quispel, "Qumran, John, and Jewish Christianity," *John and Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Chapman, 1972) 137-155, 149-155; E. E. Urbach, *The Sages - Their Concepts and Beliefs* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975), 1. 124-134, 685. See further pp. 128-129 above.

Christ as "Salvation." The St. Mark's monastery Isaiah Scroll from Qumran at 51:5 runs, "My Salvation has gone forth, and *his* arm will rule the peoples." The *Hodayoth* suggest the identification of Salvation with the offspring of David (1QH 7:18-19). Both these passages employ terms reminiscent of the Isaian Servant Songs and Isaiah 11:1-5. This evidence strengthens the probability that Simeon's Nunc Dimittis is also tributary to the custom of calling the Messiah "Salvation": "My eyes have seen your Salvation." Therefore, the name Jesus in the Hebrew very probably had messianic overtones in the decades preceding the Christian era. Matthew makes it quite clear that this redemption concerns the remission of sins, not political independence. The implication of the six verses with "Jesus (known as the) Christ" is, that the Messiah of Matthew saves from sin by his atoning death. The first three occurrences (1:1, 16, 18) are in the context of the divine inauguration of the redemption. The other three verses are in the shadow of Calvary (16:21; 27:17, 22), to which Jesus' messiahship inexorably led, 16:20-23 and 26:59-68.

A second connotation of "Christ" is that of prophetic anointing, with consequent teaching and healing authority. Three texts from the evangelist's special material illustrate this. Jesus instructs his disciples in 23:10, "Neither be called masters, for you have one master (καθηγητής), the Christ." This term is found only here in the New Testament, and there is some textual hesitation. But this does not warrant the deletion of the verse.[1] In the almost rabbinical atmosphere of 23:7-11, a fitting climax is reached in καθηγητής, with its meaning of chief interpreter or head of the school.[2] Again, Matthew alone adds χριστέ to the mockery of the scribes and elders: "Prophesy to us, Christ - who struck you?" (26:68). Here the messiah is viewed as prophetic teacher, not military leader.[3]

---

1 Against BAG, 389; Grundmann, "χρίω," 532 n. 271

2 Cf. Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 279; and comparisons to the Qumran Teacher by Hill, *Matthew*, 211; R. S. Barbour, "Uncomfortable Words: VIII. Status and Titles (Mt. 23,8-9)," *ExpT* 82 (1970/71) 137-142, esp. p. 141. On Mt's interest in the instruction of disciples: P. Bonnard, "Matthieu, éducateur du peuple chrêtien," *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux* (ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux; Gembloux: Duculot, 1970) 1-7; Thysman, *Communauté*, 27-32.

3 Cf. O. Betz, *What do we know about Jesus?* (London: SCM, 1968) 90 n. 12; Berger, "Hintergrund," 398; Hill, *Matthew*, 347; Grundmann, "χρίω," 524. (For Johannine parallels see J. Luzzaraga, *EstBib* 32 [1973] 119-136).

This understanding of the messiah appears as early as Isaiah 11:3-4, with which should be compared the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, verses 42 and 48-49. A corroborative touch is the twinning of pseudochrists and pseudoprophets in 24:24par.

Another occasion when the Christ is depicted in prophetic terms is the programmatic 11:2. The imprisoned John sent disciples to Jesus to ask if he was the one to come, for he had heard of "the deeds of the Christ." Jesus in 11:4-5 defines these deeds as the healings, the resuscitation, and the preaching of the good news to the poor. These activities sum up Matthew 5-10.[1] Obviously such actions recall Elijah, Elisha, and the prophets (who include Moses according to Deuteronomy 18:15 and 34:10; and, as will later be seen, David). A further depth of meaning is added by the inclusion between 11:2, "the deeds of the Christ," and 11:19, "the deeds of Wisdom." The prophetic Messiah is aligned with Wisdom.[2]

A third characteristic of Matthew's attitude to the Christ is expressed in his refusal to link the Messiah explicitly with the Son of David and King of Israel. Yet he takes it for granted that these titles coincide in such passages as 1:6, 20-21; 2:2-6; 21:5-9.[3] In 16:20 Jesus explicitly

---

1 Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 304 (citing H.-J. Held); Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 437 (mentioning G. Bornkamm); D. Connolly, "Ad miracula sanationum apud Matthaeum," *VD* 45 (1967) 306-325, 310; Hill, *Matthew*, 197; Cope, *A Scribe Trained*, 91-94. Kingsbury (*Matthew: Structure*, 60-65) argues further that Christ is explained by Son of God.

2 Christ is portrayed as Wisdom incarnate by 11:2 and 19 according to M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1970) 37, 56-58; D. W. Smith, *Wisdom Christology in the Synoptic Gospels* (Rome: Pontificia Studiorum Universitas a S. Thoma in Urbe, 1970) 49-55; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man. A Study of the Idea of Pre-existence in the New Testament* (SNTSMS 21; Cambridge: University Press, 1973) 67-70. But F. Christ is, correctly, less absolute in *Jesus Sophia. Die Sophia Christologie bei den Synoptikern* (ATANT 57; Zürich: Zwingli, 1970) 76; cf. Green, *Matthew*, 118, 120. However, only an analogy between Jesus and Wisdom is allowed by M. D. Johnson, "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 44-64, 56-58.
It would be unilateral, indeed eisegesis, to reduce Mt 1-2 to a wisdom christology, e.g., the infant Solomon worshipped by foreigners, the divine sonship, the obedience and persecution of the sages.

3 Compare Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 52 n. 34; Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 228 (cf. p. 224); Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 96-99. It is a bad method to explain "Christ" only from the passages where the term occurs, as is shown by the fine study of 12:17-50 in Cope, *A Scribe Trained*, 32-52.

forbids publication of the fact that he has accepted the role of Messiah, presumably because it had such political colouring for the masses (compare John 6:14-15). The evangelist so dissociates the Christ from the Son of David in 22:42-45 that he can hint at the transcendence of the former without depreciating the descent from David.[1] Lastly, the crucified King of the Jews is not mocked as a would-be messiah, in contrast to Mark 15:32 and Luke 23:35, 39. This is consonant with his depoliticization of the Christ.[2]

Summary. - The title Christ in Matthew is associated with redemption from sin by being coupled six times with "Jesus." It is also open to the prophetic concept of the Messiah as teacher and healer. But it cannot be connected with political pretensions in the accepted sense. Nevertheless, "Christ" is implicitly equivalent to Son of David and King. The concentration of five instances of the title in the Gospel of the Origins (1:1, 16, 17, 18; 2:4) implies that it has fundamental, if general, importance. Since the substance underlying a title is often present, although it is not (e.g., 12:17-50), and since titles overlap and illuminate each other, the Davidic sonship of Jesus will next be studied.

2) *The Son of David in Matthew*

A clear distinction should be maintained between *a* son of David and *the* Son of David. The first is any Davidid. The second is the Messiah who would reproduce the shalom of yore, the *pax davidica*. From the viewpoint of the theologian, the Son of David need not necessarily be a son of David. Yet the question whether Jesus really was of David's blood merits investigation, since an affirmative answer could lead to a fresh and more positive evaluation of Matthew's presentation of Jesus as the Son of David.

---

1 For Mt's editing of 22:41-46 see Suhl, "Davidssohn," 61; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 87-90; A. Fuchs, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik* (AnBib 49; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971) 97-98; F. Neugebauer, "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii,35-37 parr.) und der Menschensohn," *NTS* 21 (1974/75) 81-108, 82-84, 86-87, 92; J. D. Kingsbury "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 95 (1976) 591-602, 595-596 (mentioning J. M. Gibbs and D. M. Hay in n. 23). The Davidic sonship of Jesus is not denied, according to Suhl, Burger, Neugebauer, Hay, although subordinated to divine sonship (Kingsbury).

2 See S. E. Johnson, "The Davidic-Royal Motif in the Gospels," *JBL* 87 (1968) 140-141; Geist, "Jesusverkündigung im Matthäusevangelium," *Jesus in den Evangelien* (see p. 117 n. 5), pp. 109-110.

a. Jesus is a Son of David

(i) *The question of fact.* - Could the family of Jesus have known if they were of Judaean royal stock? The issue is bedevilled by a difficulty hardly considered in the main studies of first century Jewish genealogical traditions. Little documentary evidence has survived of domestic customs in the Palestine shortly prior to the Jewish revolt of 66-70 A.D. Therefore, the argument from silence applied to any Davidids of this period is not as strong as might seem.[1] Account must also be taken of the fact that publication of one's belonging to the royal line would hardly have been politic during the later Hasmonean and Herodian periods. Hegesippus records several persecutions of the Davidids by Roman authorities during the latter half of the first century.[2] All in all, there is no insuperable difficulty against accepting that Joseph could have been known as belonging to the House of David. The inability to coordinate the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke does not exclude this conclusion. Genealogies were statements of principle, and theological assertions, rather than starkly factual records.[3]

---

1 Albright and Mann (*Matthew*, 2-3) believe there were first century families aware of their royal descent; cf. Coggins, *Chronicles*, 26. Contrast "Wir kennen im Zeitalter Jesu niemandem - ausser Jesus - dessen Familie man als davidisch bezeichnet hätte" (D. Flusser, *Jesus in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* [Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1968] 16, cf. pp. 13-24). Flusser relies on the thesis in Hebrew of Jacob Liver, *The House of David . . . to the Fall of the Second Commonwealth and After* (Jerusalem, 1959). However, there is an inconsistency in Liver's argument. In another study he states that there is no information about the exiliarchate before 70 C.E., yet he holds their later claim to Davidic ancestry may be valid; cf. his "The Problem of the Genealogy of the Davidic Family after the Biblical Period," *Tarbiz* 26 (1956/57) 229-254 (Hebrew), i-iii (English). The evidence for Jesus being a Davidid is earlier and hardly less credible. Liver's scepticism is judged too sweeping by A. Schalit, *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* (Studia Judaica, 4; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969) 474 n. 1112.

2 In Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.12, 19-20, 22.

3 Cf. pp. 26-28 above. Although M. D. Johnson (*Biblical Genealogies*, 108) says his conclusions are "in substantial agreement with the views of Jacob Liver," he holds that even without documents the laity of the first century could know their tribe, and the names of their male ancestors for several generations. He does not expressly assert or deny that Jesus was a Davidid (cf. p. 254). But J. Jeremias (*Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 275-297, esp. pp. 290-291) discounts the accuracy of the genealogies without doubting that Jesus was of the royal line. Compare Brown, *Messiah*, 87-88, 511.

Although it was possible for an individual to be recognized as belonging to the royal dynasty, it was not a prerequisite for the Messiah. A personal Messiah was indeed expected at that time, but opinions differed widely regarding his lineage. Despite his levitical origin, Simon Maccabee could be extolled in phrases redolent of Solomon, as emerges from a comparison of 1 Maccabees 14:11-15 with 1 Kings 5:4-5. The ten or so messianic pretenders of New Testament times recorded by Josephus did not, apparently, set any store by Davidic descent. Ben Kosibah seems to have been declared a Davidid when Akiba named him Bar Kochba. But his failure won for him another appellation in the Talmud, Bar Koziba, "son of deceit." Neither, as far as is known, was there a dominant belief that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem.[1] Therefore, Davidic descent was not a contemporary messianic postulate, which would have led to the elaboration of Davidic and Bethlehem traditions about Jesus.[2] Consequently, if the Gospels,[3] the early creeds enshrined in Romans 1:3-4 and 2 Timothy 2:8,[4] Hebrews and

---

1 Blinzler, "Heimat Jesu," 15-16, with further references.

2 Compare Brown, *Messiah*, 505-507. Burger (*Davidssohn*, 10-11) lists those denying that Jesus was a Davidid (including himself) - Goguel, Conzelmann, to whom add Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn*, 29 (citing Grundmann and R. Pesch); and those in favour - Cullmann, Stauffer, Michaelis, Jeremias, Hahn, O. Betz, who now are joined by R. Fuller, E. Grässer, T. Holtz, Longenecker, Albright and Mann, Brown.

3 Johannine irony implies in Jn 7:42 that Jesus is of royal blood. See B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1972) 302-303; and D. W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel* (Theologische Dissertationen, 4; Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1970) 59-63.

4 The phrase, "Of the seed of David (according to the flesh)," has received short shrift from commentators on the Pastoral Epistles, such as J. N. D. Kelly, P. Dornier, and C. Spicq. The two state, humiliated and exalted, interpretation of Rom 1:3-4 concentrates on the resurrection, to the detriment of the Davidic sonship. For example, the latter is a theologically irrelevant dogmatic fossil for K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (SNT 7; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972) 113-115 (who, however, denies that two stages are in view). The two state interpretation strangely resembles the second century anti-Gnostic and anti-Monarchian understanding of Rom 1:3-4 as expressing a two nature christology; cf. R. Cantalamessa, "La primitiva esegesi cristologica di Romani 1,3-4 e Luca 1,35," *RStorLetRel* 2 (1966) 69-80, esp. pp. 69-71, 80.
A far more positive and satisfactory evaluation of the Davidic element is found in E. Schweizer, "υἱός," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 334-399, 366-370; G. Ruggieri, *Il Figlio di Dio davidico. Studio sulla storia delle tradizioni contenute in Rom. 1,3-4* (Analecta Gregoriana, 166; Roma: Università Gregoriana, 1968), e.g. pp. 122-123; and other works to be cited later.

Revelation,[1] proclaim that Jesus is son of David according to the flesh, this is not a deduction from dogmatic presuppositions, but a datum of human testimony.

The Synoptics certainly present Jesus as adopting a reserved attitude to messianic appellations such as Christ and King. But reserve is not rejection. Probably the Jesus of the Gospels had to achieve his messiahship before he could accept the role of Christ, which he transformed by his obedience unto death. Before his demonstration of true messiahship, there was great risk of being misunderstood if he publicly accepted the title Christ, or claimed to be the Son of David.[2] The Synoptics do not portray Jesus as denying his origin from Judah's kings in Matthew 22:41-46 and parallels. They point to a loftier dimension of Davidic sonship.[3] Again, there is no evidence of first century questioning of Jesus' royal lineage, and his opponents would hardly have neglected such a useful argument against the claims of his disciples.[4] The frequent, early, and apparently uncontested references to Jesus as a member of the first family of Judah support the authenticity of the claim.

---

1 Heb 7:11-17 implies Davidic descent: the royal priesthood of Melchizedek (Ps 110:4; Gen 49:10); E. Grässer, "Der historische Jesus im Hebräerbrief," *ZNW* 56 (1965) 63-91, 74-75. Rev speaks of the root and offspring of David in 5:5; 22:16. There is no reason to dub these passages late or unintegrated - against Burger, *Davidssohn*, 162-164 (and note the similar demur of D. M. Hay, *JBL* 89 (1970) 513).

2 Cf. Schweizer, "υἱός," 366 (citing Dalman). This approach to the "messianic secret" is shared by R. P. Martin, *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1972) 92-97, who cites O. Betz and R. N. Longenecker. Add J. C. O'Neill, "The Silence of Jesus," *NTS* 15 (1968/69) 153-167, 165-166; with the qualification by Moule, *Origin*, 34-35.

3 See the summary of recent discussion in G. Schneider, "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk 12,35-37)," *Bib* 53 (1972) 65-90, 65-80; and n. 1 on p. 149.

4 Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 291. For the second century polemic see P. Beskow, *Rex Gloriae. The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1962) 90-97. The terse denial of Jesus being a Davidid in *Barn.* 12:10 flows from the epistle's patent anti-Judaism - "un antijuif et prégnosticiste," says E. Robillard, "L'épître de Barnabé: trois époques, trois théologies, trois rédacteurs," *RB* 78 (1971) 184-209, at p. 189 n. 11. The same denial by the Ebionites springs from their condemnation of warfare, the Temple, and David's adultery, according to H.-J. Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity. Factional Disputes in the Early Church* (trans. D. R. A. Hare; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 84-87. Is it fanciful to suggest that their antagonism was fuelled by first century predominance of Davidids in the Great Church of Palestine?

Finally, the likelihood of Jesus being of royal blood is enhanced by the role played by his relatives in the Church during the century after his death. Eusebius calls the family of Jesus the δεσπόσυνοι.[1] This probably identifies them as relatives of Mar Jesus the Master, rather than as kinsmen of the ancestral δεσπότης David.[2] But, since Jesus was the heir to David, the difference was slender. The dynastic succession in the Jerusalem and Galilean churches[3] has its proceding and posterior analogues.[4] James, it is true, is not presented as a Davidid. His immediate relationship to Jesus was more significant for the Church. Vespasian ordered the

---

1 *Hist. eccl.* 1.7; 2.23; 4.22 (cf. n. 2 on p. 150). Further in A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (4th ed.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), 2. 630-635; G. Bardy, ed., *Histoire ecclésiastique I-IV* (SC 21; Paris: Cerf, 1952) 28 n. 17; A. Meyer and W. Bauer, "The Relatives of Jesus," *New Testament Apocrypha: Gospels and Related Writings* (ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher [ET ed. R. McL. Wilson]; London: Lutterworth, 1963) 418-432; J. Blinzler, *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu* (SBS 21; Stuttgart: KBW, 1967) 94-95, 103.

2 Against J. Weiss, and with Blinzler (*Brüder und Schwestern*, 103 n. 32), who follows W. Foerster; and Brown (*Messiah*, 508 n. 9), who calls them the "Master's people."

3 See Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, 630-636; K. L. Carroll, "The Place of James in the Early Church," *BJRL* 44 (1961/62) 49-67, 49-51; B. Bagatti, "I 'parenti del Signore' a Nazareto," *BeO* 7 (1965) 259-263; L. Randellini, *La Chiesa dei Giudeo-cristiani* (Studi Biblici, 1; Brescia: Paideia, 1968) 29-34.

4 The Zealot leadership espoused the dynastic principle; cf. S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots. A Study of the Political Factor in Early Christianity* (Manchester: University Press, 1967) 131-133. Towards the end of the second century the Quartodeciman bishop Polycrates of the "parish of Ephesus" informed Pope Victor that he was the eighth bishop from his family (*Hist. eccl.* 5.22-24). Harnack spoke of the Christian "Caliphate" of Jerusalem, but this category was rejected by P. Battifol, *L'Eglise naissante et le catholicisme. Les origines catholiques* (Paris: Gabalda, 1913), 1. 288 n. 1; H. von Campenhausen, "Die Nachfolge des Jacobus. Zur Frage eines urchristlichen 'Kalifats'," *ZKG* 63 (1950/51) 133-144; J. D. Crossan, "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus," *NovT* 15 (1973) 81-113, 112 n. 1. Yet qualified approval is given to the Caliphate comparison by M. Goguel, *Les premiers temps de l'Eglise* (Manuels et précis de théologie, 28; Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1949) 65-66; and attention is drawn to the parallels in high priestly and rabbinic succession by E. Stauffer, "Zum Kalifat des Jakobus," *ZRGG* 4 (1952) 193-214. See further Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 165-166 with n. 4; Randellini, *Giudeo-cristiani*, 47-50. There is, therefore, significant, though not compelling, evidence for a Christian Davidic patriarchate in first century Palestine, which reflected the esteem in which the "brothers of the Lord" were held; cf. Acts 1:14; 1 Cor 9:5; Gal 1:19.

extermination (or perhaps, deportation) of the descendants of David, but there is no record of the thoroughness of their pursuit and arrest. Therefore, it is not incredible that Christians of the royal family should survive and be interrogated by the imperial authorities in the time of Domitian.[1] It is possible that the problem of the early Palestinian church was too much Davidid influence, and not its absence![2]

Conclusion. - Some first century Jewish families could be recognized as Davidids. However, it was not necessary for a messianic claimant to belong to such a family. Consequently, Jesus' Davidic sonship is not to be dismissed as a non-historical theologoumenon. His belonging to the royal stock is presumed in the New Testament, and was not an issue in the first century. Moreover, the distinction of his lineage probably contributed to the esteem in which his relatives were later held, and led to their investigation by the Roman administration. In a word, according to the historical standards of his time, Jesus was a son of David.

(ii) *The significance of this fact for Matthew 2.* - The dominant motif of this chapter is the lethal opposition between King Herod and the Christ, the Son of David. Many commentators have grounded this opposition in

---

1 Against Burger (*Davidssohn*, 123-127), who follows W. Wrede and H. Conzelmann. Jewish Christian tradition cherishes his royal descent; cf. Randellini, *Giudeo-cristiani*, 37-38. It is remembered by a Jew at the beginning of the third century, according to the unexpurgated edition of *Sanh.* 43a in J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques* (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1867; repr. 1971), 1. 349 n. 2.

2 The opening chapters of Acts contain traces of a political Davidicism. "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?," 1:6. Succession to the apostolic ministry is regulated by David's instructions in 1:19. The "patriarch" David explains the resurrection as the enthronement of his descendant, 2:29-35. He also has a political commentary on the passion, 4:25-27. The fact that Mary or Jesus' kinsfolk did not receive an empowering apparition has been explained from "ecclesiastical politics" by G. W. Trompf, "The First Resurrection Appearances and the Ending of Mark's Gospel," *NTS* 18 (1971/72) 308-330, esp. pp. 310-315, 325-330; cf. Crossan, "Relatives of Jesus," 104-113. Even the debate over judaizing may have been more heated because of the prestige of the conservative family of Jesus. These are but conjectures. The material to hand does not seem adequate to prove or disprove them. Yet it is a priori likely that theology in the first decades was literally a flesh and blood affair, deeply rooted in culture, and much exercised with orthopraxis. In such a milieu the clan of Jesus, with its Davidid aura, would have an influence unfamiliar to a detribalized, post-monarchist age.

contemporary circumstances. Herod the Idumean-Arab was conscious of his ethnic disqualification to rule in Judaea. Therefore, he was uneasy in the face of Jewish messianism.[1] There is no doubt that he was sensitive about his mixed blood. Herod's sycophant Nicolas of Damascus fashioned a Jewish pedigree for him.[2] Julius Africanus recalls his destruction of the genealogical archives, "in the belief that he would appear of noble origin if no one else was able by reference to public registers to trace his line back to the patriarchs or the proselytes or the *gerim*."[3]

There was some early polemic arising from the base origin of Herod. In the *Assumption of Moses* 6:2-6 Herod is described as, "not of the race of priests," unlike the Hasmoneans. "He shall slay the old and young, and shall not spare. Then the fear of him shall be bitter unto them in their land. And he shall execute judgment on them as the Egyptians executed judgment upon them - during thirty and four years." Here Herod the alien is associated with the Gentiles, and contrasted to the Jews. His barbarity is reminiscent of Matthew 2. *Psalm of Solomon* 17 may be contemporaneous to Herod. Of the Hasmoneans it says, "They laid waste the throne of David . . . but thou didst cast them down, O God . . . in that there rose up against them a man that was alien to our race" (verses 7-9). If their anonymous opponent was Herod,[4] his non-Jewish origin is again stressed, and he is implictly criticized as a ruler not from David's stock. Verse 28 makes the expulsion of the sojourner and the alien from Jerusalem a part of the programme of the Son of David. An Idumean would fall into the category of a *ger toshab*, because they were not true converts, but victims of the

---

1 Herod's attitude was determined by his Edomite origin according to J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD I/1; 3d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1937) 17. Referring to R. Eisler, Lohmeyer (*Matthäus*, 22-23) admits it as a possibility. See n. 3 on p. 156.

2 *Ant.* 14, §9. Early statements concerning the antecedents of Herod the Great are conveniently summarized by H. W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* (SNTSMS 17; Cambridge: University Press, 1972) 5-6 n. 2.

3 *Hist. eccl.* 1.7.13. Jeremias (*Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 282) thinks that by destroying the records Herod may have hoped to check the messianic claims of the House of David, which was a menace to his power.

4 As is held more probable by O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament. An Introduction* (trans. P. R. Ackroyd; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) 612; cf. Schalit, *König Herodes*, 463-464, 471. But he is identified as Pompey by G. B. Gray, *APOT* 2. 648; M. Delcor, "Psaumes de Salomon," *DBSup* 9 (1973) 214-245, 235-236, whose arguments are not conclusive.

statutory circumcision by Hyrcanus.[1] Antagonism to Ḥerod's gentile usurpation of the throne of David is echoed centuries later in Eusebius. In his *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.6 he cites Genesis 49:10 to the effect that only when a foreigner ruled in Israel would the expectation of the nations be fulfilled.

None of these Jewish texts explicitly opposes Herod to the messiah of David. Yet Abraham Schalit believes that a convergence of clues indicates that Herod was trying to restore the glory of the kingdom of David.[2] Although he cannot determine how the Idumean established his apparent claim to belong to the House of David, Schalit thinks he saw himself even as the Davidic messiah.[3] But this remains only an attractive hypothesis. It is conceivable that his supporters, the Herodians, considered him the messiah (if not necessarily the Son of David). The third century Pseudo-Tertullian, *Against All Heresies*, chapter 1, mentions that the Pharisees derived their name from the fact that they were separated from the rest of Jewry by their special interpretation of the Law. This sound observation lends credence to the next sentence, which says the Herodians thought Herod was the messiah. Epiphanius narrates that they called their leader *Christos*.[4]

---

1 Rabbinic criticism of this forcible judaization indicates that Idumeans were classed as resident aliens; and distaste for the foreignness of Herod may find expression in the unfavourable reference to "purple-red" Herod from "Edom" and his Roman allies in *Midr. Cant.* 7:6. This is the view of V. Aptowitzer, *Parteipolitik der Hasmonäerzeit im Rabbinischen und Pseudepigraphischen Schrifttum* (Veröffentlichungen der Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 5; Wien: Kohut-Foundation, 1927) 56, 47.

2 *König Herodes*, 474-476; 450-460, "Das Reich Herodes und das Reich des Messias." The Hasmoneans had a similar goal; cf. P. R. Ackroyd, *I & II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah* (Torch Bible Comm.; London: SCM, 1973) 32.

3 *König Herodes*, 460-482, "Die Botschaft des Herodes"; also his "Die 'herodianischen' Patriarchen und der 'davidische' Herodes," *ASTI* 6 (1968) 114-123. Reviewers have not been slow to point out the flimsiness of the evidence he adduces, e.g., G. Baumbach, *TLZ* 95 (1970), cols. 337-340; K. Müller, *TRev* 67 (1971) 353-359. Schalit's attempt to get inside the mind of Herod cannot rise above the level of a highly educated guess, e.g., pp. 474 nn. 1113, 1114; 476 n. 1116. Yet he was anticipated by T. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara: Der Rüsttag* (Zürich: Drell & Füssli, 1867), 1, 174, 179, 181, 382-383. Rothfuchs (*Erfüllungszitate*, 101 n. 25) cites Keim with approval.

4 *Panarion* 20:1; cf. E. Hammerschmidt, "Königsideologie im spätantiken Judentum," *ZDMG* 113 (1964) 493-511. Contrast Safrai and Stern, *The Jewish People* I/1, 277 n. 7 (M. Stern).

Another piece of evidence, whose relevance has only recently been grasped, is a passage from the Qumran Cave Four *Patriarchal Blessings*. The Blessing of Jacob foretells the "Messiah of Righteousness, the Branch of David. For to him and to his seed was granted the Covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations" (3-4). Hartmut Stegemann explains the polemic against the Edomite (associated with Amalek and the accursed Esau) as directed against the Herodian dynasty, which will be annihilated at the end of the days, and replaced by a son of David, a descendant of Jacob.[1] He believes there is no evidence to show the Herodian/Davidid antithesis was popular outside Qumran. Nevertheless, he continues, "A similar rivalry between the 'illegitimate' Herodian and the ideal Davidic kingship structures the presentation of Herod in *Matthew* 2, and furnishes the *specific* messianological content of the tradition about the massacre of the Bethlehem children."[2] Immediately he adds that any historical reminiscence here can clarify the Bethlehem story "*materialiter*," but sheds no light on its purpose. This is restrictive. Stegemann believes Jesus was born and reared in Capernaum.[3] Perhaps this is why he underestimates the verisimilitude of Herod's racial inferiority complex being the foil in Matthew 2 to the authentic Davidic sonship of Jesus the Christ.

Conclusion. - Antagonism to Herod as the alien usurper of the city and throne of David appears as certain or probable in various Pharisaic sources, in Qumran, in Josephus, in early Christian writings, and in a few rabbinical passages. This abhorrence of Herod's gentile origin probably springs from its being considered an affront to the eternal covenant of Yahweh with David. It is plausible that Herod's propaganda in Judaea depicted him in traits appropriate to the royal messiah. Certainly,

---

1 "Weitere Stücke von 4Qp Psalm 37, von 4QPatriarchal Blessings, und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Excerpten aus dem Deuteronomium," *RevQ* 6 (1967/68) 193-227, 214-227.

2 "Ein derartiges Konkurrenzverhältnis zwischen 'illegitimem' herodianischen und idealem davidischen Königtum ist jedenfalls für die Herodes-Darstellung in *Matthäus* 2 konstitutiv und stellt die *eigentliche* messianologische Aussage der Überlieferung vom bethlehemitischen Kindermord dar" ("Weitere Stücke," 217 n. 92). Without reference to Qumran, an analogous evaluation of Mt 2 is offered by Strecker, *Weg*, 147 n. 2, 247; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 60.

3 See the refutation by Blinzler, "Heimat Jesu," 14-20.

Matthew 2 derives a richer texture and a keener point when placed in this setting. The importance of the royal descent of Jesus is obvious in Matthew 1. Therefore, this Gospel of the Origins is best approached under the patronage of King David.[1]

b. Jesus is the Son of David

The investigation will be carried out in three stages. First, the appreciation of David in first century piety will be savoured. Then this vital figure will be detected in Matthew 3-28. Finally the Davidic imagery of the two opening chapters will be appraised.

(i) *The First Century Saint David.* - The emphasis now passes from fact to interpretation. *A* son of David is one of a succession of figures who people all periods of Israelite history for almost a millenium before Christ. *The* Son of David is a unique individual, a hero permeated by the hopes, the contemplation, and the ideals of the people of Israel during the centuries before Matthew.[2] The messianic figure known as the Son of David is usually considered by scholars in his role as a public personage and the founder of the eternal dynasty - the monarch, the judge, the conqueror. Disappointment with the levitical Hasmoneans, followed by the hellenizing despotism of the half-breed Herod and the gentile domination of Rome, made Israel yearn for this Son of David.[3]

---

1 This conclusion is of methodological moment. It represents a very different interpretation of Mt 1-2 from that of many exegetes, who stress dependence on the Moses tradition, e.g., Vögtle, *Messias und Gottessohn*; Paul, *L'évangile de l'Enfance selon saint Matthieu*; Nellessen, *Das Kind und seine Mutter*. Mt's debt to Moses is downplayed by Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 89-92; and attributed to the pre-matthean stage by Brown, *Messiah*, 108, 117, 162-163.

2 A convenient and perceptive summary of the first century belief in David as "a living image embodying the aspirations of the covenant people for renewal and vindication, . . . the instrument through whom the light of the knowledge of God would go out to the nations, that through him there would be a renovation of the worship of God and the defeat of the powers of evil," is found in Kee, *Community of the New Age*, 125-126.

3 On this upsurge of interest in the Messiah ben David see Fuller, *Foundations*, 30-31; Coppens, *Messianisme royal*, 116-125; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 16-24; Longenecker, *Christology*, 65-66; S. Zedda, *L'escatologia biblica: Antico Testamento e Vangeli Sinottici* (Esegesi biblica, 6; Brescia: Paideia, 1972), 1. 182-187; M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, in W. Grundmann, F. Hesse, de Jonge, van der Woude, "χρίω," 509-521. The Qumran witness is summarized by Fitzmyer, "'Elect of God'," 130-135, 139.

More important for the New Testament, especially for the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, is the Son of David as a private person. Here the emphasis falls on the first David as the prototype of the servant of God. The focus is on his obscurity, his trials, his election by Yahweh and special relationship to him, his faithful service, his sacred poetry, his domination of the forces of evil, and his prophecy and glimpses of what the Christ would be like. It is noteworthy that when Eduard Lohse writes about the Son of David in Volume 8 of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, he entitles his Old Testament section: "1. King David; 2. The Messiah of David's Lineage." But for the New Testament treatment he has to subdivide King David into the three roles of Servant of God, Prophet of Christ, and Type of Christ. Here we are a far cry from the majestic public personage that first strikes the reader of Second Samuel. This later David is all things to all men. Here is a model of service and piety, of religious eloquence and worship, which can nourish the devotion of every man. Yet Lohse and others[1] have not drawn many conclusions about the actual religious significance of the living David for the New Testament. The Christian figure is Saint David, rather than King David. A neglected avenue to Jesus the Christ is the appreciation of him as the Davidic prophet and servant of God.

Material which sheds light on the first century hagiography of David and the Son of David includes: (a) Sirach 47:1-22; (b) The Psalter in its manifold adaptation, e.g., the Psalm titles, Psalm 151 LXX, *Psalms of Solomon* 17, and the Qumran Psalms Scroll; (c) Wisdom of Solomon 7-9; (d) the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo, chapters 59-63; and (e) Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 6, §156 - 7, §394.

---

1 Ernst Lohmeyer was a pioneer in his neglected, *Gottesknecht und Davidsohn* (FRLANT 61 [43]; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1953 [1945]).

2 The later Christian trajectory of David could be traced through the *Didache*, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, the *Testament of Solomon*, the Byzantine theocracy (Eusebius of Caesarea), Ambrose's *Apologia* of David (cf. *Targ. Chron.*), Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms, the "David" who ruled the early monasteries, *Kontakion 1* (The Nativity) of the Syrian-born Romanos, the carlovingian New Israel under David/Charlemagne, the Crusaders' reestablishment of the kingdom of David/Christ, the medieval jurists on the *character angelicus* of the king, with his two bodies (physical and mystical). Some of this afterlife will be drawn on below. See also the rather ordinary article on "David" by J. Daniélou in *RAC* 3 (1957), cols. 594-603.

(a) *Sirach 47:1-22.* - These portraits of David and his son are far from regal. Like Saul in the preceding verse (46:20), David commences in an atmosphere of prophecy, 47:1. Verses 2-7 recall his election by God "as the fat is set apart from the communion sacrifice," and his youthful exploits against wild beasts, Goliath, and the Philistines. The following three verses admire his incessant praise of the Most High, and his patronage of the Temple music and song. Finally, in verse 11, "The Lord forgave him his sins . . . He conferred on him the rights of royalty (NAB; διαθήκην βασιλέων LXX)." This appreciation of David is steeped in the levitical piety of the second century before Christ, and honed by the consciousness of the danger of seduction by foreign ways. Goliath and the Philistines had by then been replaced by the Seleucids and the hellenizers. Here is a David with whom the contemporary Jew could identify: the sacrificial divine election, a youth remarkable for his prayerful and valiant devotion to his daily task and beleaguered people, an adulthood notable for psalmody and worship, for love of his Maker, and for enjoying divine forgiveness and blessing. This is a David for everyman.[1]

Like any worthy paterfamilias, David merited a son and heir who was wise and cared for his patrimony, 47:12-13. Famous for his songs, stories, parables, and answers, he was called by the very name of Israel in Jeremiah 11:15, "Jedidiah," "Beloved of the Lord," 47:14-18. However, he succumbed to the sins of the flesh, so castigated by the sages; but Yahweh honoured his promise to David by raising up a root of his stock, 47:19-22. The wisdom of Solomon, and his being cherished by the Lord, are traits that recur in the Son of David of the Gospels.

(b) *The Psalmody of Later Judaism.* - α. The Psalm Titles: At least as early as the third century before Christ the Songbook of the Second Temple was cherished as the prayerbook of David. In the masoretic text thirteen out of the seventy-three psalms ascribed to David are given a life setting in his career, especially during the years prior to his accession to the throne, namely, Psalms 3, 7, 18, 34, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, and

---

1 Sir has the highest regard for the covenant with David, as is shown by 45:25 ("an individual heritage through one son alone"); 47:11, 22; 48:16; the puzzling "I called on the Lord, the father of my Lord [David?]" in 51:10LXX; 51:12(8). Despite his reticence about a royal messiah, he hardly subordinates the monarchy to the priesthood (against de Jonge, "χρίω" 512); cf. R. T. Siebeneck, *CBQ* 21 (1959) 425-428.

142.[1] This process of relating the psalms to the life of David accelerated with the passage of time. The Septuagint attributes eight further psalms to David, expands some titles, and multiplies historical settings, for example, Psalm 26 LXX "Before he was anointed"; 29, 37, 64, 92-100; 143 "Concerning Goliath." All five Syriac Apocryphal Psalms are ascribed to David, and at least three of them have a pre-Christian Hebrew prototype. Three are linked to David's early life as a shepherd.[2] About 130 A.D., the desire of Aquila for a literal version led him to render the *l^eDawid miktam* introducing Psalms 58 and 59 by "of David the lowly and the perfect" (reading *mak tam*, ταπεινοῦ τελειοῦ).[3] More titles are added in the Targum and Peshitta. Theodore of Mopsuestia represents the climax of this tendency. In his Commentary every psalm is treated as spoken by David. He is considered to have foreseen such manifestly posterior events as the destruction of the Temple.[4]

Why was there such interest during the first century in interpreting the Psalms against the background of David's experiences? The obvious

---

1 Among many commentators, see A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1972), 1. 43-46. A striking analogue to this Davidic piety occurs in the sole psalm attributed to Solomon, 127. The building of the house (v. 1) is understood of the Temple. "He gave sleep to his beloved" (singular in Heb., plural in LXX) in v. 2 refers to the dream of Solomon-Jedidiah (2 Sam 12:25; and see p. 160 above) in 2 Kgs 3:5-15. Significantly, the mere mention of Solomonic authorship implies an application of the psalm to the relationship of the king with Yahweh. Another instance from Jewish literature of this autobiographical outlook is *Pirqe Aboth* 6:3, which deduces that a student must honour his teacher because David called Ahithophel, from whom he learned but two things, "his companion, and his familiar friend" (Ps 55:13).

2 P. W. Skehan, "Again the Syrian Apocryphal Psalms," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 143-158, with references to J. A. Sanders in n. 3 of p. 143.

3 See J. F. A. Sawyer, "An Analysis of the Context and Meaning of the Psalm-Headings," *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 22 (1967/68) 26-38, 33.

4 See further M. F. Wiles, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 1. 497-501. Earlier Justin argued against Trypho that several psalms referred to David, not Hezekiah; and Aphrahat insists that Ps 22 speaks of the pierced Christ, not Saul (*Demonstratio* 17, §10). Like the Jews, Christians understood the psalms in the light of David's spiritual odyssey. But for them David is really Christ. A. T Hanson (*Studies in Paul*, 13-51) develops at some length his parallel and attractive theory that Paul hears the pre-existent Christ speaking through the mouth of the prophet David in many psalms.

answer is, that this hero of the spirit was seen as the model for men of piety. The psalm titles probably stemmed from *hasidim* concerned with the nurture of the spiritual life. By these biographical settings "David's inner life was now unlocked to the reader, who was allowed to hear his intimate thoughts and reflections."[1] This Davidic kerygma of the psalms is prophetic, in the sense of disclosing the ways of God with man. It supplies moral guidance and exhortation.

Of course there are deep Old Testament roots to this spirituality. The king of the Deuteronomist resembles the sage of Psalm 1, who stands not in the way of sinners, but delights in the law of the Lord. According to Deuteronomy 17:19-20, the monarch shall write out his own copy of the Torah. "He shall read in it all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God . . . that his heart may not be lifted up above his brethren, and that he may not turn aside from the commandment." A citizen king, indeed, and a constitutional monarch! Even the most royalist of royal psalms, 89 and 132, correlate the Mosaic and Davidic covenants.[2] The last reforming king of Judah, Josiah, is described in terms of the *Shema*: "Before him there was no king like him, who turned to the Lord with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; nor did any like him arise after him" (2 Kings 23:25).

A song of David which appears in 2 Samuel 22 (compare Psalm 18) runs in part, "The Lord delivered me because he delighted (εὐδόκησεν) in me. The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness (δικαιοσύνην) . . . With the pure (ἐκλεκτοῦ) thou dost show thyself loyal . . . Thou dost deliver a humble (πτωκόν) people" (22:20-21, 27-28). Not only does David speak to Yahweh as "the sweet singer of Israel" on behalf of the people, but he enjoys the second prophetic gift of speaking for Yahweh to the people. He is "the man who was raised on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob," who could proclaim, "The Spirit of the Lord speaks by me, his word is upon my

---

1 B. S. Childs, "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis," *JSS* 16 (1971) 137-150, 149.

2 Cf. B. de Pinto, "The Torah and the Psalms," *JBL* 86 (1967) 154-174, 161-162; W. H. Brownlee, "Psalms 1-2 as a Coronation Liturgy," *Bib* 52 (1971) 321-336, e.g., pp. 330-334; T. N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah* (Lund, 1976) 289-290; also, J. Coert Rylaarsdam, "Jewish-Christian Relationship: The Two Covenants and the Dilemmas of Christology," *JES* 9 (1971/72) 249-270, 262-267. Pss 72 and 101 (David's "mirror of the prince") also repay consideration.

tongue" (2 Samuel 23:1-2). The vocabulary would have had a deep religious resonance for Christians: Πιστὸς Δαυιδ, πιστὸς ἀνήρ ὃν ἀνέστησεν κύριος ἐπὶ χριστὸν θεοῦ . . . πνεῦμα κυριοῦ ἐλάλησεν ἐν ἐμοί καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. In short, an admirable royal life style may be discerned in these psalms and passages from the Deuteronomist. Here the king is the servant, the poor man, the humble, persecuted, suffering one. He is equally the just man, who is chosen, raised up, beloved.[1] Therefore, it is not surprising that by the first century the psalms came to be prayed as the rhythmic *legenda* and oracles of the christened Saint David.

β. Psalm 151 LXX: This supernumerary psalm is more explicitly confessional and self-revealing than earlier canonical compositions. Its popularity is evident from its appearance in Qumran Cave 11 in a form both truncated and embellished, and more fully in the first Syriac Apocryphal Psalm.[2] Here there is a miniature theology of grace. David is the least (μίκρος) and youngest of his family, fit only to tend the sheep and make music and praise his Lord. But the Lord heard his prayers, took pleasure (εὐδόκησεν) in him, and "christed" him (ἐχρισέν με). Then he slew Goliath, or, as the Hebrew has it, "He made me a ruler of the sons of his covenant." That David commands the sons of the covenant (a phrase also in Ezekiel 30:5LXX and *Psalms of Solomon* 17:17) typifies the interpenetration of the Mosaic and royal covenants at this late period. The worshipping *anawim* can expect a reward exceeding great. If the synagogue liturgy used Psalm 151 as a responsorial psalm to adapt 1 Samuel 16:1-12 and 17:12-37 for public reading,[3] the point being made here about the filtering of the psalms through Davidic hagiography would be confirmed.

---

1 The LXX Psalms always have ἀγαπητός for יָחִיד (cf. Solomon-Jedidiah in 127:2). For the royal connotation see Ps 45(44), ᾠδὴ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, and three psalms of David: 60:5(7); 68;12; 108:6. It means only son, the heir who is bearer of the promises; cf. E. Lövestamm, *Son and Saviour* (Lund, 1961) 96; T. De Kruijf, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes* (Rome, 1962) 50, 124; and who must suffer, Martin, "Shepherd," 272.

2 P. W. Skehan, "The Apocryphal Psalm 151," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 407-409; "Syriac Apocryphal Psalms," 143-147; M. Delcor, "Zum Psalter von Qumran," *BZ* 10 (1966) 15-28, 16-21; J. Magne, "Orphisme, Pythagorisme, Essénisme dans le texte hébreu du Psaume 151?," *RevQ* 8 (1975) 508-547, 533-543 (also pp. 548-591; and a reply by J. Carmignac on pp. 592-597). On the "Orphic" David at Dura-Europos see G. Delling, "ὕμνος," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 498 n. 59.

3 As suggested by S. B. Gurewicz, "Hebrew Apocryphal Psalms from Qumran," *AusBR* 15 (1967) 13-20.

γ. *Psalms of Solomon* 17: Verses 7-8 and 23-51 are most germane, with a parallel in 18:6-10. Only here in extant pre-Christian literature is the messiah called the Son of David (17:23), and "Christ" used in its technical sense (v. 36; cf. 18:6). Although the strain of universal salvation is muted, the king is no purely martial figure. He destroys the pride of the sinner, not the sinner himself. He leads a holy people in righteousness, knowing that they are "all sons of their God" (vv. 25-30). He cleanses Jerusalem, but does not annihilate the pagans. "He shall judge the peoples and the nations in the wisdom of his righteousness." The Son of David will not rely wholly on the force of arms, or amass wealth. He rules through his word, and God grants him strength through his holy spirit. Under this shepherd there will be no class distinction or exploitation (vv. 45-46). He will inaugurate a new era of holiness. Here one is closer to the moralizing of Deuteronomy, Isaiah (especially 11:1-5, 9-12; 49:3-9, 12), Psalms 2, 89, 132, and the Synoptics, than to the King of Kings of Revelation. Behind the majestic public figure of David there is the private person with the moral majesty of the messiah of the prophets and the poor.[1]

δ. The Qumran Psalms Scroll: Column 27 summarizes David's literary output.[2] First his domestic virtue is noted: "(He was) a scribe, intelligent and perfect in all his ways before God and men." Then his compositions are said to total 4,050. They comprise 3,600 psalms and songs for the daily

---

1 Compare M.-A. Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie* (Paris, 1958) 10-17; R. W. Klein, "Aspects of Intertestamental Messianism," *CTM* 43 (1972) 507-517, 509-510 ("a scribe-king"); Delcor, "Psaumes de Salomon," cols. 244-245; M. Dumais, *Le langage de l'évangélisation (Actes 13,16-41)* (Tournai/Montréal, 1976) 166-168. - There must be many lacunae in our knowledge of first century Jewish messianic expectations. For instance, Philo appears to see his transcendent eschatology partially realized in the Mosaic sage; yet he nowhere speaks of a pacific messiah, and the warrior messiah figures once in the nationalistic passage, *Rewards* 16, §§95-97. See further, F. Grégoire, "Le Messie chez Philon d'Alexandrie," *ETL* 12 (1935) 28-50; Chevallier, *L'Esprit*, 32-41; Jaubert, *Alliance*, 382-385. Since the messianic hope was very much alive in the second century, it is baffling that the pre-70 A.D. Tannaim are silent on the subject. For suggested explanations see van der Woude, "χρίω," 521-522. Chevallier (p. 44) shrewdly concludes that such unwonted discretion is a reaction to Christian messianic claims.

2 J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^{a})* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 48, 91-93; cf. G. W. Anderson, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 1. 151-153; Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 265. The Qumran Ps 91 will be drawn on in the next paragraph, on exorcism.

and Sabbath sacrifices, and for the New Moons and feasts and Day of Atonement. The notice concludes with, "All these he uttered through prophecy which was given him from before the Most High." Here at the frontier of the ages David is at last explicitly designated as a prophet. This was implicit in 2 Samuel 23:2 and in Chronicles;[1] becoming explicit in Acts 2:30, and *Antiquities* 6, §166, which describes Samuel's secret anointing of David in these terms: "The Deity abandoned Saul and passed over to David, who, when the divine spirit had removed to him, began to prophesy."[2] Matthew 22:43 and Mark 12:36 write from the same supposition that David addressed his son the Messiah as "Lord" - "in the (holy) Spirit."[3] It is not at all surprising, therefore, that the man of God who arranged the praise and music of the Temple is called "David the prophet of the Lord" in the Peshitta at Nehemiah 12:24 and 36.

(c) *Wisdom 7-9.* - These chapters date to perhaps 50 B.C. At the beginning "Solomon" asserts his solidarity with the rest of mankind, 7:1-6. Then wisdom is extolled as a divine gift, and the proper object of prayer, 7:7-9:18. One verse in particular is striking, where Solomon says God gave him knowledge of "the powers of spirits (πνευμάτων βύας) and the reasonings of men, the varieties of plants and the virtues of roots" (7:20). The messianic era was to be marked by wondrous cures according to Isaiah 26:19; 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 61:1-2 (passages echoed in Matthew 11:2-5). The intertestamental literature shows a lively expectation of such healing, whether in general terms or in connection with the apocalyptic tree of life, e. g., *Jubilees* 1:29; 23:26-29; 1 *Enoch* 25:5-6; 95:4; 96:3; 2 Esdras 8:52-53. The Essenes may have been credited with healing powers. But nowhere are cures ascribed to the Messiah himself, although they result from his reign in 2 *Baruch* 56:6 and 73:2, and 1 *Enoch* 55:4. Consequently, Matthew's coupling

---

1 Cf. D. N. Freedman, "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry," *JBL* 96 (1977) 5-26, 21-22; Newsome, "Chronicler and His Purposes," 203-204.

2 See J. A. Fitzmyer, "David, 'Being Therefore a Prophet . . . ' (Acts 2: 30)," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 332-339. He could have strengthened his case by mentioning 2 Sam 23:2, and Sir 44:2-6, which associates leadership and prophecy. He believes it is not impossible that Qumran and Josephus understood David's anointing not of his regal function, but of prophecy.

3 So Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 90 n. 2. Neugebauer ("Davidssohnfrage," 89) speaks of an apocalypse of David. Compare M. de Jonge, "Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel," *ETL* 49 (1973) 160-177.

of marvellous cures with invocation of the Son of David in 9:27, 15:22, and 20:30-31 (compare 12:23 and 21:9, 14), has perplexed many exegetes.[1] Instead of positing contacts with the thaumaturgy of Moses and Elijah, a far simpler and more satisfying explanation emerges from taking seriously the appeal of the blind and the possessed to the "Son of David."

In the Old Testament, the description "son of David" always refers to one of his children, often Solomon.[2] Therefore, in this investigation the figures of David and Solomon are paramount. The first act of the youthful David after his secret anointing with the Spirit was to banish the evil spirit from Saul, 1 Samuel 16:13-23. This was not forgotten. Whenever the daimons assailed Saul, "he had no other physician than David, who, by singing his songs and playing upon the harp, restored Saul to himself," says Josephus in *Antiquities* 6, §168.[3] The mantle of exorcist, and therefore healer, fell on Solomon, as Wisdom 7:20 indicates. In *Antiquities* 8, §§45-49, Josephus recounts the use of a Solomonic incantation and a root prescribed by him to exorcise a man in the presence of the emperor. "When this was done, the understanding and wisdom of Solomon were clearly revealed" (§49). Even Christians of Jewish background seem to have had a shrine to Solomon the healer, probably at the Probatic Pool.[4] Therefore, the appeal of the afflicted to the Son of David reflects a popular belief in the royal power over spirits This cry, for Matthew, was testimony to the merciful Davidic Messiah, who conquers the powers of evil.

---

1 E.g., Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 190, 358, 383-386; Fuller, *Foundations*, 31, 47, 111-112, 189-191, who can evoke as analogous only the (putative) Mosaic eschatological healing prophet. Burger (*Davidssohn*, 169-170) considers that Mt's healing Son of David betrays "seine mangelnde Kenntnis der jüdischen Vorstellung vom davidischen Messias"! Even as careful a study as Kingsbury's "Son of David" misses much of the richness (e.g., p. 598).

2 G. Schneider, "Zur Vorgeschichte des christologischen Prädikats 'Sohn Davids'," *TTZ* 80 (1971) 247-253.

3 11QPs^{a} 27 lists four songs of David for those afflicted by malign spirits; and his Ps 91 seems to be apotropaic, as his song in *Bib. Ant.* 60: 1-3 certainly is. Drawing on studies by L. R. Fisher, E. Lövestamm, and K. Berger, the evidence is very capably marshalled by D. C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David," *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-252. See also his "The Therapeutic Son of David in Matthew: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic," *NTS* (1977/78) 392-410, 407-410.

4 According to B. Bagatti, "I Giudeo-cristiani e l'anello di Salomone," *RSR* 60 (1972) 151-160, who also cites Origen, *PG* 13, col. 1757. Further, Hull, *Hellenistic Magic*, 33-34; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 61-69.

(d) *Biblical Antiquities 59-63.* - The work ends with Saul acknowledging that he is dying because of his disobedience to God, as Samuel had predicted, and sending a request to David to overlook his hatred and unrighteousness (65:4-5). The reign of this wronged and persecuted David is presented as the climax towards which all is moving: 51:6; 56:2; 58:4; 59:1; 62:2, 9, 11. From the moment of his anointing by Samuel the Lord is with him, and he bursts into song about God defending him by his angels and Watchers (compare Psalm 91:11),

> For my brothers were jealous of me,
> and my father and mother thought little of me.
> When the prophet (Samuel) arrived they did not call me,
> and when the Lord's anointed was to be designated, they forgot me.
> But God with his right hand and his mercy drew near me;
> therefore I will ever praise him, every day of my life.[1]

The stones he used to kill marauding animals are a sign of his future prowess (59:5). The psalm he composed to exorcize Saul plumbs the order of creation, and identifies the tribe of daimons as creatures of a second order. Furthermore, the *metra nova* (unique womb?) from which he sprang will bear his descendant who will subdue the powers of evil (60:1-3). In slaying Goliath he inscribes the names of Israel's heroes and of the Almighty on the seven stones, and makes the doomed Philistine behold the angel who guides his sword stroke (61:5, 8). David's pact with Jonathan emphasizes his innocence, and the righteousness of his father Jesse. There is an echo of Psalm 151, in his declaration that he is the least of his brothers, and merely a shepherd (62:4-5). Lastly, if David is the speaker in 63:3, he is the foreteller of the doom of Saul and Jonathan. In sum, the David of Pseudo-Philo is a man whose greatness lies in his being chosen by God, and protected and guided by angels. He is humble and righteous, and acknowledges his dependence on the Lord by praise and gratitude. Despite his mastery over evil and devotion to his people, he is persecuted by the man he most helped. Nevertheless, he will usher in a new age: *ex te initium erit regni advenientis in tempore* (62:9).

---

1 See the critical text established by D. J. Harrington in Harrington, J. Cazeaux, Ch. Perrot, and P. M. Bogaert, *Pseudo-Philon. Les Antiquités Bibliques* (SC 229 and 230; Paris: Cerf, 1976), 1. 364-366 (59:4). This hymn manifests interest in the psychology of David, whereas, "In his canonical writings David practiced a greater modesty!" (J. Strugnell, "More Psalms of 'David'," *CBQ* 27 [1965] 207-216, 216). Because of the work's pre-70 A.D. setting, a human Messiah does not feature (Perrot, 2. 57-59).

(e) *Jewish Antiquities 6, §156 - 7, §394.* - The aristocratic Judaean priest, Flavius Josephus, bases his apologia for the Jews on considerable familiarity with the traditions of his people. Whatever nationalistic, political sympathies and hopes he may have retained after the apparent volte-face at Jotapata are muted in deference to his pagan audience. Nevertheless, he mentions approvingly the conquests of David, and Nathan's oracle concerning the stability (but not now the perpetuity) of his line.[1] Josephus uses Saul and David to convey his ideals of kingship, which are brought out in such passages as 6, §§262-268, 343-350; and 7, §§390-391. Jonathan revered David for his virtue, 6, §206 (ἀρετή). The quality most frequently ascribed to David is "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη) - 6, §§160, 290; 7, §§130, 391. He is also presented as obedient to God, pious, prudent, humane, and valorous.[2] These virtues are certainly rooted in hellenistic soil, yet they are not foreign to the righteous, obedient, and merciful Son of David of Matthew.

Josephus' original emphases in his account of the anointing of the youthful David by Samuel are particularly revealing of his Jewish outlook. In 6, §§156, 164-165, the secrecy of the actions nominating the future king is several times stressed, in order to prepare the reader for the harassed David's hidden life before he ascends the throne.[3] In Matthew, Christ's conception from the Spirit, baptismal legitimation, transfiguration, and recognition as Messiah by Peter, are likewise not for immediate public proclamation. Twice integrity and obedience are demanded of the Messiah designate: the Son of David accepts baptism to fulfil all righteousness,

---

1 *Ant.* 7, §§92-95. Josephus is willing to let it be understood that he considers Vespasian the Messiah. But he has one extraordinary sentence about the stone uncut by human hand of Dan 2:34-35, which implies a cryptic Jewish messianic hope. Although in the original text Daniel explains its significance to Nebuchadnezzar, Josephus remarks, "But I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be" (10, §210). As will later be seen, this mysterious stone is associated with the Davidic Messiah.

2 *Ant.* 7, §§390-391. See H. W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the* Antiquitates Biblicae *of Flavius Josephus* (HDR 7; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976) 40, 68-69, 109-140 (esp. pp. 110, 115-116, 119-121). Compare the earlier moralizing observations: "David, because he was merciful, inherited the throne of the kingdom for ever" (1 Macc 2:57); and his conquest of great thirst by Reason in 4 Macc 3:16-18 (cf. 18:15).

3 On this private initiation see Z. Weisman, "Anointing as a Motif in the Making of the Charismatic King," *Bib* 57 (1976) 378-398, 379-385, 395.

and his fidelity is then tested by Satan. Later Josephus presents David as a man of the Spirit, healer, and prophet (6, §§166, 168; 8, §§109-110),[1] and as a king of peace and of sacred song and music (7, §§305-306). These traits reappear in Matthew's Son of David. In short, Josephus does not gloss over the temporal glory and the frailty of David, but he highlights his religious qualities and interior life. He is silent about the hopes he may well have placed in the coming Son of David.

Summary. - In first century Judaism David is not only a model of piety and fidelity to the Lord who loved him, but the man who spoke in the Spirit of the ways of God with men. He is the chosen one, who is raised up. As the prophet-king he speaks not merely on behalf of God as teacher and revealer, but also on behalf of himself and Israel as favoured intercessor. The wise David taught the people to know Yahweh, to praise[2] and obey him. The Psalms unlocked his heart to the devout: his trust in his grace during periods of neglect and persecution, his fidelity to the Law, his humility rendering him the prime witness to divine power and love. Sprung from the *metra nova*, protected by angels, he conquered sin and demonic forces in the power of the Spirit. His righteous Son was expected to restore Israel and enlighten the nations. The following pages illustrate how this spiritual experience of Saint David aided the infant Church to recognize his son, Jesus, as the Christ, and to cling to him in faith and love. Here is sensed the dynamism of *lex orandi, lex credendi*.

---

1 See further Fitzmyer in n. 2 on p. 165; Duling in n. 3 on p. 166. The prophetism of David was also mediated through the canonical psalms, as shown by J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms* (London, 1976) 175-176.

2 The Dura-Europos panel of the musician David may represent a pre-Christian tradition. Another panel certainly follows a centuries-old view. In Ex 2:5 a servant picks the infant Moses out of the Nile rushes, but at Dura-Europos it is the daughter of Pharaoh who does so. This change accords with the second century B.C. Jewish tragedian Ezekiel, and the *Tg. Ps.-J.*; cf. Vermes, "Bible and Midrash," 230-231. Again, the resuscitation of the saints in Mt 27:52-53 has been explained in the same light by J. Grassi, "The Resurrection and the Ezechiel Panel of the Dura-Europos Synagogue," *TBT* 11 (1964) 721-726. In the present context, therefore, it is worthy of note that the panels of the anointing of David by Samuel, and of the "Orphic" David, which are to the right of, and above, the Torah niche, may body forth the key role played by the prophet David in the psalmody and preaching of the congregation. Cf. E. Lohse, *TDNT* 8 (1972) 479 n. 9; and Magne and Delling in n. 2 on p. 163; as well as the more general considerations of M. Smith, "Goodenough's *Jewish Symbols* in Retrospect," *JBL* 86 (1967) 53-68, 63-64.

(ii) *The Son of David in Matthew 3-28.* - In the main, this investigation follows the order of the Gospel. Since its scope is limited to detecting the contribution of the royal prophet to these chapters, the exposé is incomplete and unilateral. It does not pretend to furnish a rounded exegesis. Only a partial effort is made to distinguish tradition from later editing. When the evangelist's christology is sought, it is the finished work which is primary, and not its - hypothetical - process of composition. If Matthew incorporated older material, he did so because he agreed with it.

(a) *Matthew 3 and 17: Baptism and Transfiguration.* - In 3:14-15 Matthew deems it necessary to stress that Jesus fulfilled all righteousness with complete deliberation. Afterwards the voice from heaven proclaimed: "This is my son, the Beloved, with whom I am well pleased." Four elements of this scene have a regal tinge. The divine sonship recalls the coronation of the Davidid in Psalm 2:7. Indeed, the so-called Western reading in the Lucan parallel continues the citation with, "today I have begotten you."[1] It has been shown above that the ἀγαπητός may be connected with the first son of David, Jedidiah. It is true that this adjective is thrice applied to Isaac on Mount Moriah in Genesis 22:2, 12, 16. But later interpretation identified Moriah with the Temple mount, e.g., 2 Chronicles 3:1 and *Antiquities* 7, §333. Also, the Abrahamitic and Davidic covenants were deliberately aligned.[2] Therefore, it is quite possible that the aura of David and Solomon would invest Isaac.[3] A final pair of observations is that righteousness and divine good pleasure belong to David in 2 Samuel 22:20-21(28).[4]

---

1 Considered original by J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (NT Library; London: SCM, 1975) 27, with n. 73.

2 See n. 2 on p. 35; and M. Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," *IDBSup*, 188-192, 189-190; T. Ishida, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel. A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (BZAW 142; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1977) 110-112, 116-117.

3 On the royal ἀγαπητός cf. n. 1 on p. 163, and the range of opinions in Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 62. A composite citation is accepted even in the strong case made for an allusion to Isaac by R. J. Daly, "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 45-75, 68.

4 Cited on p. 162. An exaggerated, but thought-provoking, divine kingship interpretation of the Baptism is given by Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 227-229, cf. pp. 133-135.

Although many commentators on Matthew and Luke consider the primary reference is to the Servant of Isaiah 42:1, none of the Greek versions here tallies with the Synoptic expression. It is true that Matthew's rendering of the first Servant song in 12:18-21 uses the same phrase as does the divine voice at the baptism and transfiguration. But Matthew 12:18 probably derives from these passages, not vice versa.[1] Also, Isaiah 42:1-7 describes a Servant with the regal functions of liberating, ruling, and judging. Consequently, if the First Gospel echoes this passage, a reference to David the servant is not excluded. There may also be a colouring of 2 Samuel 22:20; particularly since in Psalm 151:5 it is said of David's brothers that the Lord did not take pleasure (οὐκ ἐυδόκησεν) in them.[2]

The transfiguration has clearer affinities to the ancient royal ideology.[3] Elements such as the six days, very high mountain, transformed appearance, tents, overshadowing cloud, and listening, have been credibly associated with Moses and the exodus.[4] Yet they can all be linked to other backgrounds.[5] As with the baptism imagery, Israel's traditions are

---

1 Compare J. Grindel, "Matthew 12,18-21," *CBQ* 29 (1967) 110-115, who (with K. Stendahl) notes that the בחיר of Isa 42:1 is never rendered ἀγαπητός in the LXX or Hexaplaric material, and the latter is probably an exegetical translation, prompted by early Christian vocabulary (p. 110); Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 73. Daly ("Sacrifice of Isaac," 69 n. 53) thinks Mt may be citing a translation variant which is not now extant.

2 It seems clear that none of these suggested texts (Isa 42; Ps 2; Gen 22; 2 Sam 22) is dominant. However, Mt 3:17 was interpreted in the light of Ps 2:7 by the *Gos. Eb.*, Justin, and other early Fathers, according to Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 140 n. 2. On the royal aspect of the baptism see also De Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 52-54; F. H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (NT Library; London: SCM, 1967) 367-369; Schweizer, *TDNT* 8 (1972) 368; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 192 n. 131, 194-195; I. H. Marshall, "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh? A Reconsideration of Mark i. 11," *NTS* 15 (1968/69) 326-336, 332-336. It is intriguing that Mt 3:2-4:17 shares many terms with the death of the King and the salvation of the saints in 27:40-55, e.g., voice, Galilee, holy city, raise up, ἀφίημι, Son (of God), Spirit, serve, darkness, ἀνεῴχθησαν (listed by Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 346-347).

3 Cf. Borsch, *Son of Man*, 382-387 (following Harald Riesenfeld).

4 See the commentaries; and Boismard, *Synopse*, 2. 253 (who on p. 250 illustrates Mt's borrowing from Dan 10:1-12 in 17:2-7 - a non-Mosaic dimension elaborated by Murphy-O'Connor, "Structure," 378-380).

5 E.g., Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 253-255; Schweizer, *TDNT* 8 (1972) 369; *Matthäus*, 227-228; Lange, *Das Erscheinen*, 426-434; J. Coppens, *Le Messianisme et sa Relève prophétique. Les anticipations vétérotestamentaires: leur accomplissement en Jésus* (BETL 38; Gembloux: Duculot, 1974) 184-187.

melding in the centuries preceding the Common Era. As a result the divine approval of the righteous, beloved, and favoured Son of God at the baptism and transfiguration would be readily comprehensible as the commissioning of the royal prophet.

(b) *Matthew 4: Testing, Kingdom, Shepherd of the Twelve Tribes.* -

α. Testing the Son of God: Distant parallels to the three trials of 4:1-11 can be found in the story of David. He is hungry at Nob (1 Samuel 21:2-6), and thirsty near Bethlehem (2 Samuel 23:13-17). His grandiose plan to raise a temple to Yahweh is misconceived (2 Samuel 7:1-11). Several times he refuses to snatch at the kingship when Saul is at his mercy, e.g., 1 Samuel 24 and 26. These narratives have no apparent influence on Matthew. Does Satan suggest a Zealot career? This would be in essence an obscuring of the ideal of total love of the neighbour.[1] Yet the militaristic overtones, descried by a few commentators in each temptation, are far from evident. The most likely hypothesis is that presented in a series of studies by Birger Gerhardsson, who defines the testing as that of the fundamental demand of biblical faith - the love of God with all man's heart, soul, and might (Deuteronomy 6:5).[2] This explanation fits Jesus' three citations from Deuteronomy 6 and 8. It crystallizes the human struggle into the prototypical situation. The whole prayer and faith of Israel, the quintessential *Shema*, is here at stake. In the temptation scene Matthew's steady insistence on the love of God and all men[3] comes into focus. The king was the ideal Israelite. Josiah, the last of the few worthy Davidic rulers, had his virtues summed up in the formula of the *Shema* in 2 Kings 23:25. It is at least possible that the royal son of the baptism is here being tested in his kingly and filial wisdom, which is total fidelity to

---

1 P. Hoffmann, "Die Versuchungsgeschichte in der Logienquelle. Zur Auseinandersetzung der Judenchristen mit dem politischen Messianismus," *BZ* 13 (1969) 207-223; cf. M. Hengel, *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?* (FBBS 28; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 26.

2 *The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1-11 & par). An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* (*ConNT* 2; Lund: Gleerup, 1966), esp. pp. 20-70. He pursues his study of Matthean covenant love in "The Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation," *NTS* 14 (1967/68) 165-193. These two studies are convincing, as are, in general, his "Du Judéo-christianisme à Jésus par le Shema[c]," *RSR* 60 (1972) 23-36; and, "Gottes Sohn als Diener Gottes. Messias, Agape, und Himmelsherrschaft nach dem Matthäusevangelium," *ST* 27 (1973) 73-106.

3 See pp. 124-125 above.

the Torah.[1] This is corroborated by the use of the Davidic Psalm 91 expressing the angelic protection of the king in 4:6. The theme was current, as evidenced by Qumran and Pseudo-Philo, and the more than twelve legions of angels in Matthew 26:53, as well as ("his") ministering angels in 4:11, 16:27, 25:31.[2]

β. The Kingdom and its King: Both John the Baptist and Jesus proclaim the advent of the kingdom of the heavens, 3:2 and 4:17. An earthly king is implied. Note the significant change of key between 2 Samuel 7 and the version of Nathan's oracle in 1 Chronicles 17. Particularly striking is the alteration of the plural "your offspring" and "your house and kingdom" (7:12, 16) to the singular "one of your sons . . . [whom] I will confirm in *my* house and *my* kingdom" (17:11, 14). This is not a downgrading of the Davidic monarch, as "his kingdom" in 17:11 shows. But the shift of emphasis does make it clear "that a Davidic king to come will be Yahweh's representative in the restored Israelite theocracy."[3] Indeed, First Chronicles regularly associates David with Yahweh. He has an army "like the army of God" (12:23); and his concerns are those of the Lord (cf. 26:32). The whole *ekklesia* bent the knee and did homage to the Lord and the king (29:20). Neither should it be forgotten that "Christ" for first century Palestine meant the Messiah of the house of David: Jesus "the King"![4]

---

1 See pp. 122-123 above, and p. 219 below.

2 On Ps 91 cf. pp. 166 n. 3, 167; Eaton, *Psalms*, 57-58. For further possible background in royal Adam consult Borsch, *Son of Man*, 278-279, 370-372; Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel* 105-107; Neugebauer, "Davidssohnfrage," 99-101. An interesting monarchist parallel to the angelic ministry of Mt 4:6, 11, is the subordination of the angels to the Son in Heb 1-2, which is based on the Davidic psalms 2, 8, 45, 110, and Nathan's dynastic oracle. These passages may have as a background the liturgy of a king's festival, according to M. Barth, "The Old Testament in Hebrews. An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics," *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. Essays in honor of Otto A. Piper* (ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder; London: SCM, 1962) 53-78, 72-73. Cf. J. W. Thompson, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 353-359 (but not relying on metaphysics; see next n.).

3 J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Son of David Tradition and Mt 22:41-46 and Parallels," *Essays*, 113-126, 119. Compare J. D. Newsome, *JBL* 94 (1975) 208-210; J.-B. Dumortier, "Un rituel d'intronisation: le Ps. LXXXIX 2-38," *VT* 22 (1972) 179-196, 186-189 ("véritable lieutenant de Yahvé," p. 187).

4 Note the emphasis of Vermes (*Jesus the Jew*, 132), that in the first century Eighteen Benedictions, "the most essential Jewish prayer, the one and only Messianic citation is formulated in terms of [Davidic] royalty."

γ. The Shepherd of the Twelve Tribes: There is a number of connotations in Matthew 4 of the Davidic Shepherd of the twelve-tribe United Kingdom, which for convenience may be treated together. First, there is the fulfilment formula quotation of Isaiah 8:23-9:1 in verses 15-16, which marks the transfer of Jesus from Nazareth to Capernaum. This is the evangelist's third extract from the Davidic Book of Emmanuel in Isaiah 7-11 (7:14 is cited in 1:23; and, probably, 11:1 in 2:23). Isaiah 8:23-9:1 refers to the reincorporation of the lost ten tribes of Israel into the restored theocratic kingdom of the Son of David. One author goes so far as to hint that the Gospel citation might have been a contribution of the Galilean δεσπόσυνοι.[1] This suggestion is, of course, unverifiable. But it does point in a promising direction. Here Jesus is a light to Israel, in the restricted sense of the Northern Kingdom. Several times Christ defines his mission as one to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10:6; 15:24). It is possible that this implies a prolonged ministry among the ten tribes before ascending to Jerusalem.[2] Such a ministry to both Kingdoms was expected of the Davidic Messiah, who was to reunite the twelve tribes, e.g., Isaiah 11:10-13; 49:5-6, 18-23; Jeremiah 23:1-6; 30-31; Ezekiel 34:11-31; 37:15-28 (graphically illustrated in the Dura-Europos panel of the ten tribes and the two leaders); and Zechariah 9:11-11:14.[3] The ingathering of Israel is also expected outside the prophets, for example, in Tobit 13:5, Sirach 36:10, and *Psalm of Solomon* 17:30, 45, 50. This regrouping is often associated with shepherding. Matthew connects the lost sheep with the mission of

---

1 Johnson, "Davidic-Royal Motif," 143. Schoeps (*Jewish Christianity*, 24-25) thinks along similar lines. On the family of Jesus see pp. 153-154.

2 W. G. Thompson, "Reflections on the Composition of Mt 8:1-9:34," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 365-388, 387 n. 55. Cf. above pp. 139-141, esp. n. 1 on p. 141.

3 The prophets' hope for the re-establishment of the dominion of David is outlined by J. Mauchline, "Implicit Signs of a Persistent Belief in the Davidic Empire," *VT* 20 (1970) 287-303, esp. pp. 294-298 on the Davidic resonance of Isa 8:23-9:1; D. C. Greenwood, "On the Jewish Hope for a restored Northern Kingdom," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 376-385; M. Barker, "The Two Figures in Zechariah," *HeyJ* 18 (1977) 38-46. See further K. Müller, "Menschensohn und Messias. Religionsgeschichtliche Vorüberlegungen zum Menschensohnproblem in den synoptischen Evangelien," *BZ* 16 (1972) 161-187; 17 (1973) 52-66, at pp. 179, 55-58, 65-66 (fifth empire in Dan 7:9-22 is that of David [cf. M. Casey, *NovT* 18 (1976) 175-178]). "For the Chronicler, at least, the Lord's Kingdom was the whole *Davidic* Kingdom, with . . . a *Davidic* King on the throne" (Buchanan, *Consequences*, 58).

Jesus and his disciples, whereas Mark 6:34 has shepherdless sheep in the more political context of the feeding of the multitude. The Son of David's shepherding task of uniting the kingdoms of Israel and Judah into the single "beach-head" of the Kingdom of God is a work of prophetic discipling, healing, and saving from sin.[1]

Secondly, corresponding to the territorial claims of the Davidic realm were its twelve divisions presided over by twelve regional governors.[2] Jesus' choice of the Twelve is described by Mark and Luke, but taken for granted in connection with the Son of David (9:27, 36-37; 10:6) in 10:1-4.[3] Their mission is to Israel, and in the Kingdom they will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, Matthew 19:28 and Luke 22:30. The commissioning of the Twelve recalls Solomon's administrative measures, which Josephus attributes to the aged David in *Antiquities* 7, §368.

Thirdly, David is the prototypical shepherd of the Old Testament. However, the image is frequently applied to rulers in ancient times, for example in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Greece.[4] The picture is a natural one in pre-industrial society, and may have overtones now difficult to savour.[5]

---

1 An excellent appreciation of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd in Mt is offered in a study remarkable alike for its theological content, exegetical method, and literary sensitivity, by F. Martin, "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Matthew," *ScEs* 28 (1975) 261-301. Pp. 274-279 and 282-283 are relevant here. Martin would concur with the assertion, "It is quite impossible to read the Old Testament prophets through the eyes of Duhm and Hölscher and yet understand what the New Testament is hearing in the Old!" (B. S. Childs, "The Canonical Shape of the Prophetic Literature," *Int* 32 [1978] 46-55, 54). Cf. L. Brodie, "Creative [Re-]Writing: Missing Link in Biblical Research," *BTB* 8 (1978) 34-39, 34.

2 See J. Robinson, *The First Book of Kings* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: University Press, 1972) 58-60, on 1 Kgs 4:7-19.

3 S. Freyne, *The Twelve: A study in the theology of the first three gospels* (Stagbook; London/Sydney: Sheed and Ward, 1968) 72-80. Mt omits an account of the calling of the Twelve "in order to highlight Jesus' own ministry of word and work" (p. 168). See also pp. 37-48.

4 J. Jeremias, "ποιμήν," *TDNT* 6 (1969 [German 1959]) 485-502, 486-487.

5 On the mediatorial role of the shepherd-king see H. Gottlieb, "Die Tradition von David als Hirten," *VT* 17 (1967) 190-200. He posits a humiliation of the sacred king at the renewal of the royal covenant during the New Year feast: "I dismiss you from your office of shepherd" (2 Sam 7:8; and the sword of Zech 13:7), pp. 196-199. This fragile hypothesis (cf. Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 30, 307) at least has the merit of alerting scholars to the possibility of a greater density of religious meaning in the shepherd-king imagery.

The notion of shepherd is not bucolic or delicately pastoral. It conjures up the ideas of devotion and responsibility, rather than being carefree, or enjoying power and rights. Ideal leadership is in question. The Old Testament calls God and the Davidic Messiah shepherd, but never the reigning monarch.[1] The corresponding images of shepherd king and the flock which is his people are found in contexts of divine anger causing distress. The shepherd image is common in connection with the judgment to come: Jeremiah 13:20; 25:34-37; Ezekiel 34; Zechariah 10:3. Matthew's first usage has this thrust. The reminiscence of 2 Samuel 5:2 in Matthew 2:6 presents a Davidid leader of Judah who will shepherd Israel, in contrast to the unworthy Idumean of 2:3. The phrase "my people Israel" comes after three mentions of Judaea, and probably implies the reintegration of the Northern Kingdom. The universalism of the imperial Davidic tradition appears in 25:31-46, where the Shepherd King and Son of Man judges "all the nations".[2] The same outreach to the Gentiles is apparently already present in the quotation from Isaiah in 4:15-16, which gives the north-eastern borders of the Davidic realm, "the circuit of the Gentiles."[3] To sum up, Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel in 4:15-16, 10:6, and 15:24, is in harmony with the prophetic anticipation of the Davidic shepherd who would reunite and re-establish Judah and Israel in an everlasting Kingdom of righteousness and peace.

(c) *Matthew 5-7, 13, 18, 23-25: Expounder of the Law, Sage, Judge.* - The wisdom tradition is eminently royal, and both David and Solomon are renowned for their literary compositions, and even parables (1 Kings 4:32 [5:12LXX]; Proverbs 1:1, 6). The king is the teacher of mankind.[4] Matthew

---

1 J. T. Willis, "Micah IV 14 - V 5 - a unit," *VT* 18 (1968) 529-547, 546-547; McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 95-96 (David as good shepherd five times).

2 Cf. Christian, *Jesus*, 17-27; J. P. Meier, "Nations of Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102, 99-101.

3 In a passage stressing the union of "all Israel" around David as "brothers" (1 Chr 12:23-40), special mention is made of the arrival of "their neighbours from as far as Issachar and Zebulun and Naphtali" (v. 40). They assembled to make David king (vv. 31-34), knowing the times (32).

4 Further, A. Feuillet, "Le fils de l'homme et la tradition biblique," *RB* 60 (1953) 170-202, 321-346, at pp. 322-330; N. W. Porteous, "Royal Wisdom," *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Presented to Professor H. H. Rowley* (VTSup 3; ed. M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas; Leiden: Brill, 1955) 247-261; Eaton, *Psalms*, 181-194 (royal admonition and witness).

has shown Jesus teaching the crowds with authority (7:29), and as one greater than Solomon (12:42). Now in chapter 13 he underlines the royal wisdom of the parables of the Kingdom, by commenting on them in the words of the psalm of Asaph,[1] 78:2, in 13:35.[2] Asaph is the literary and prophetic professional, the liturgical laureate of the priestly David of Chronicles. As the part-author and custodian of the Psalter he gains a place in Matthew.[3] He is associated with Ethan (Jeduthun) and Heman, sages of the tribe of Judah (1 Kings 4:31 and 1 Chronicles 2:6), whose names appear in the titles to psalms 39, 62, 77, and 88. They are also presented as prophets, and even Levites (1 Chronicles 6:33, 44; 25:1-2)! This addition of a levitical pedigree to the Judahites is far from being an oversight. It is the Chronicler's way of saying that their post-exilic equivalents are the singers and spiritual guides of the second Temple.[4] What is significant for the Matthean context is, that wise men, prophets, and psalmists coalesce in the centuries immediately preceding Christ. A similar pietistic cast of thought appears in the saintly and prophetic Davidicism of Matthew. The great discourses about the Kingdom in the First Gospel are the ordinances, instruction, and witness of the Son of David.

---

1 On Asaph see 1 Chron 15:16-17; 16:7-37; 25:1-9; 2 Chron 20:14-17; 29:30-31; 35:15; Neh 11:17-18; 12:45-47 ("in the days of David and Asaph of old"!); E. C. B. MacLaurin, "Joseph and Asaph," *VT* 25 (1975) 27-45, 35-40. On the kingly flavour of wisdom note the wordplay between *mōshel* (ruler) and *mashal* (parable). Cf. J. de Vaulx, *Les Nombres* (SB; Paris: Gabalda, 1972) 258; W. Wifall, "Israel's Covenant Wisdom," *TBT* 64 (1973) 1046-1052, 1049; also, Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 188, 365, 376.

2 The quotation is attributed simply to "the prophet." This was probably the original reading, despite the preference for Isaiah of F. Van Segbroeck, "Le scandale de l'incroyance. La signification de *Mt.* XIII,35," *ETL* 41 (1965) 344-372, 360-365; and Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 32, cf. p. 90. Mt has, as Van Segbroeck and Rothfuchs indicate, interpreted Jesus' Galilean ministry in Mt 4-13 against the background of Isaiah's message of proferred and rejected salvation. To avoid the jarring note of introducing the name Asaph, he leaves the prophet anonymous in 13:35. Compare Pesch, "Gottessohn," 404-405; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 127 n. 230.

3 On 1:8 see next note. Asaph's psalm 80 is echoed in a parable shot through with Davidic motifs, Mt 21:33-46. See (i) below.

4 On the deliberate "mistake" in history as a technique for making a theological point, see Childs, "Psalm Titles," 144-145: Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 206-207; Coggins, *Chronicles*, 24-25. Mt writes "Asaph" in 1:8 to bring home the prophetic and prayerful element in the Davidic inheritance. Cf. W. Beilner, "Die Kindheitsgeschichten der Evangelien," *TPQ* 117 (1969) 301-314, 304; Goulder, *Midrash and Lection*, 230, cf. p. 206.

(d) *Matthew 8-11 and 20: The Royal Touch.* - These chapters describe the cures worked by the Son of David, 9:27 and 20:30-34 (compare 12:22-23). His disciples share this therapeutic power that inaugurates the Kingdom, 10:1, 7-8. Jesus heals also as Servant (8:16-17) and Son of God (9:29). But these titles are synonymous in many contexts with Son of David.[1] The background in contemporary Jewish religious expectation has been sketched on page 166. This element of royal messianism is so pervasive to Matthew that it will arise again in relation to the Son of David's mission to the Gentiles (15:21-28), and his taking possession of Zion in 21:9-15.

(e) *Matthew 12 and 15: The Servant-King and Spirit-filled Son saves the Nations.* - O. Lamar Cope's convincing analysis of Matthew 12:22-50[2] reveals that this passage develops in turn three phrases of the Isaian quotation in 12:18-21. These are, "I will put *my Spirit* upon him" (the Beelzebul controversy and sin against the Holy Spirit in verses 22-37); "he shall proclaim justice to the *Gentiles*" (Jonah's preaching to the men of Niniveh in 38-45); and "*my servant* (*son* - παῖς)" (true sonship of the Father in 46-50). The healing Son of David is incorporated in verses 23-24. Therefore, the title of this paragraph is justified from chapter 12 alone. The evangelist's sensitivity to the extra-Israelitic sway of David is seen in his "Canaanite" woman pleading with the "Son of David" (15:22). Her homeland Sidon is the "firstborn of Canaan" according to Genesis 10:15 and 1 Chronicles 1:13. Canaan must acknowledge her master, Genesis 9:25-27. In order to do so, the Canaanite woman enters the area subject to David, 15:21-22.[3] Even the Gentile is saved by the Son of him who brought them of yore the *pax davidica* - 2 Samuel 7:1 (cf. 1 Kings 8:56; 2 Chronicles 8:2).

---

1 In Mt the symbol of the shepherd (esp. from Zech 9-13) connects the Servant and the Son of David, as shown by Martin, "Shepherd," 276-277, 281, 287-291, 297-299. Ch. 7., B., deals with the Davidid as the Son of God.

2 *A Scribe Trained*, 32-52. Cf. Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ*, 50, 69.

3 David's census embraced his Canaanite subjects around Tyre and towards Sidon: 2 Sam 25:6 (simplified in 1 Chron 21:4). Cf. P. W. Skehan, "Joab's Census: How far North (2 Sam 25:6)?," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 42-49. Solomon, too, was active in this general region, e.g., 1 Kgs 8:65-66; 9:10-13, 19 (cf. 2 Chron 8:2-6). The woman entered David's domain according to T. Lovison, "La pericopa della Cananea *Mt.* 15,21-28," *RivB* 19 (1971) 273-305, esp. pp. 277-281, 290. Her appeal to the Son of David implies sharing the messianic blessings of the Israel of David. Compare Luz, "Jünger," 154, with references in n. 60.

(f) *Matthew 14 and 15: The Royal Banquet.* - Judging from their situation in Jewish and Gentile territory respectively, and the symbolic numbers involved (twelve and five, seven and four), the twin feedings of the multitudes in 14:15-21 and 15:32-39 are presented as benefiting both believers from the old faith and converts from paganism. All are fed at the repast of the Shepherd-King (σπλαγχνίζομαι - 9:36; 14:14; 15:32).[1] The eschatological and general messianic overtones, as well as the eucharistic and ecclesiological developments, are indicated by commentators.[2] But the political, not to say regal, flavour receives scant attention.[3] Such royal bounty has its roots in the ancient ideology of kingship,[4] which is almost programmatically expressed in 1 Kings 4:20-21, "Judah and Israel . . . eat and drank and were happy. Solomon ruled over all the kingdoms"; and in 1 Chronicles 12:38-39, "All these men of war, arrayed in battle order, came to Hebron with full intent to make David king over all Israel . . . And they were with David for three days, eating and drinking, for their brethren had made preparation for them." Some royal psalms take this up in lyric mode - 72:3, 6, 16; 132:15; cf. 36:8. David distributed provisions when he brought the ark to Zion (2 Samuel 6:18-19), and made Mephibosheth and Chimham share his table (2 Samuel 9:13; 19:32-40; cf. 2 Kings 25:27-30). Similarly, the frequent image of feasting in the Kingdom of God (e.g., Matthew 8:11par.; John 6:11-15), and Matthew's parable of the marriage of the king's son (22:1-14), inject a regal tint into the messianic banquet. There is also the juxtaposition of the temptations to turn stones into bread and receive the kingship of the world, Matthew 4:3 and 8-9. Thus the satiating of the dependent crowds is an eminently royal deed.

---

1 Mt, typically, stresses the authority of Jesus: "I am unwilling to send them away" (15:32). "Cette autorité s'accomplit dans la compassion; Jésus n'est pas un agitateur de foules; il ne les utilise pas; il les accueille, les rassemble et les nourrit" (Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 236).

2 E.g., Boismard, *Synopse*, 2. 221-225, 238-240; Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 300-307; I. de la Potterie, "Le sens primitif de la multiplication des pains," *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (ed. J. Dupont; Gembloux: Duculot, 1975) 303-329.

3 But see R. Trevijano Etcheverría, "Crisis mesiánica en la multiplicación de los panes (Mc 6,30-46 y Jn 6,1-15), *Burg* 16 (1975) 413-439.

4 See conveniently W. Brueggemann, "Kingship and Chaos (A Study of Tenth Century Theology)," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 317-332, 328-330; "Weariness, Exile and Chaos (A Motif in Royal Theology)," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 19-38.

(g) *Matthew 16 and 17: Peter-Eliakim, Steward of the new Temple.* - The House and court circle of David play a key role in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, and later in Zechariah 12:7-13:1. Also, the New Testament frequently considers the Church as the New Temple; and the old Temple was the twin of the palace of the king - 2 Samuel 7:11-13 (the ambivalent "house"); 1 Kings 8:20. On his throne to the south of the Temple the Davidid literally sat at the right hand of God. After Peter acknowledges Jesus as the Messiah and (Davidic?) Son of God, he is assured, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 16:19). Most commentators relate this to the giving of the key to the house of David to Eliakim in Isaiah 22:22.[1] But the fuller meaning of the passage is lost if it is not sensed that Jesus is here acting as the Son of David restoring the fallen tent of his ancestors (Amos 9:11; also, Acts 15:13-18), and looking to the new Temple built of living stones. The earnestness of his work for the latter appears in the fact that he was executed for presuming to be the King of the Jews and master of the Temple, as the following paragraphs show. It is not eisegesis to associate the key of David with the new Temple or *ekklēsia*. Precisely this coupling is found in Revelation 3:7 and 12, in a context of keeping the commandments of Jesus (verses 8-10; cf. Matthew 16:19). The royal connotations of 16:16-19 are corroborated by the scene of the exemption of the king's sons from paying the Temple tax in 17:24-27. Here Peter, the son of the Father (cf. 5:9, 45; 6:9; 12:50) and steward of the royal house, is linked with the Son of David who need not pay the half-shekel.

---

1 E.g., M'Neile, Lagrange, Schmid, Grundmann, Albright and Mann, Schweizer, Green, Gomá Civit (who draw - Green excepted - no conclusion from the link). Peter's stewardship of the renewed house of David is a power based on his faith and ability to interpret the Torah of the messianic King, the Son of God, according to B. Rigaux, "St. Peter in Contemporary Exegesis," *Conc* 27 (1967) 147-179, 167; R. Pesch, "The Position and Significance of Peter in the Church of the New Testament," *Conc* 4/7 (1971) 21-35; J. Kahmann, "Die Verheissung an Petrus. *Mt.*, XVI,18-19 im Zusammenhang des Matthäusevangeliums," *Mt: Rédaction et théologie*, 261-280, 271-279.

A series of possible reminiscences of Jer 1:4-19 in Mt 16:13-23 is proposed by B. T. Dahlberg, "The Typological Use of Jeremiah 1:4-19 in Matthew 16:13-23," *JBL* 94 (1975) 73-80; cf. Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 233-234. Certainly the notions of both Jeremiah and Peter being impregnable fortresses, and the conflict with Jerusalem, are germane. But the Davidic background integrates Christ, Son, rock, church, gates, keys (see [i]).

(h) *Matthew 21(:1-17) and 22(:41-46): David restores Zion.* - Recent writers place most of Matthew 20:29-23:39 under the patronage of David.[1] Alone of the Synoptics Matthew explicitly interprets the entry into Jerusalem as that of a king (21:5). Only he has Jesus acclaimed as Son of David, 21:5, 9, 15.[2] Certainly he plays down the pomp of the king taking possession of his capital and sanctuary.[3] Jesus is the righteous and humble monarch of Zechariah and the Psalms.[4] Like Solomon on his coronation day, he takes peaceful possession of Zion astride a donkey (mule) to the tumult of its citizens (1 Kings 1:38-45). Afterwards he reforms the sanctuary and approves a choir, 21:12-13, 15-16.[5]

His first activity in the Temple is that of the Son of David of popular piety. Matthew 21:10-11 and 14-16 are proper to the evangelist. Verses 10-11 recall the Davidic second chapter of the Gospel, with their commotion in Jerusalem[6] and identification of Jesus as the prophet from Nazareth in

---

1 E.g., Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 266, "Les ch. 21 et 22 nous font assister au Jugement qui oppose Jésus, le Fils de David, à Jérusalem, la ville de David." Of the four parables in 21:28-22:14 he says, "L'autorité royale du Fils de David en est comme le fil conducteur" (p. 274; cf. pp. 291-292). Compare Green, *Matthew*, 174; Gomá Civit, *Mateo*, 2. 293. Contrast Kingsbury, "Son of David," 596-597, who exaggerates the subordination of Jesus' Davidic to his divine sonship.

2 Origen knew a more royalist reading, "Hosanna to the House of David" (see Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 448). An echo of Gen 49:10 is probable, with its Davidic overtones. Further, but less credible, royal symbolism is proposed by Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 230-232.

3 Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 82-83; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 84.

4 Davidic psalms pulsate in Mt 21-23: Ps 8:2 in 21:16; Ps 110:1 in 22:44; and esp. Ps 118 in 21:9, 42 and 23:39 (an inclusion). The NT hapax in 21:15, θαυμάσια (denoting the Isaianic healings of the Christ, 11:2, 5), may be inspired by David's θαυμαστή (21:42) and θαυμαστόν (Ps 8:1, 9).

5 Jerusalem's king was guardian of its Temple. See N. Poulssen, *König und Tempel im Glaubenszeugnis des Alten Testaments* (SBM 3; Stuttgart: KBW, 1967). The Messiah was expected to purify the sanctuary; cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17:30; D. Juel, *Messiah and Temple. The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 31; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 136-139, 169-215. Mt has mentioned in 16:16-18 this prerogative of the Son of David to build a new "Temple." Further, Betz, *What do we know about Jesus?*, 87-92; D. R. Catchpole, "The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi.64)," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 213-226, 223-226; L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovT Sup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 65-243, esp. pp. 147-154.

6 R. Kratz, *Auferweckung als Befreiung. Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus* (SBS 65; Stuttgart: KBW, 1973) 50.

Galilee. Verses 14-16 display at least three contacts with the Davidic tradition. First, there is the healing in the Temple court of the blind and the lame, the very category excluded from the House of the Lord by the first David in 2 Samuel 5:8 LXX. Now the Son of David respects his ancestor's prohibition by healing the ritually unclean who came to him in the Temple![1] Then there is the acclamation there by the children of the Son of David.[2] Lastly, the eighth psalm of David is quoted by Jesus "to still the enemy and the avenger." Its superscription εἰς τὸ τέλος may have prompted Christians to savour its eschatological fulfilment.[3] Yet the very fact of its Davidic authorship permits its application to the Son of David in 21:16.

The question of the sonship of the Messiah is very deliberately the climax of controversy in Matthew. Since the Pharisees cannot explain how the Christ is both David's son and David's Lord, they are reduced to silence, as intimated in the unspoken continuation of Psalm 8:2 cited by Jesus in 21:16. "Nor from that day did any one dare to ask him any more questions" (22:46). He has been beseeched and hailed as the Son of David in 20:30-31 and 21:9, 15. He has acted as Davidic master of the Temple and healer in 21:12-15. He has cited his forefather's songs in 21:16, 42, and 22:44. If it be granted that the gathering together (συνηγμένων, 22:41) of the Pharisees colours the whole scene with the second psalm, several of the latter's phrases become active. For example, "The rulers take counsel (συνήχθησαν) together against the *Lord* and his *Christ* . . . I have set my *king on Zion* . . . You are *my son*" (Psalm 2:2, 6, 7).[4] The Davidid is here

---

1 See n. 4 on p. 137 for allusion to Jer 31:8-12, at the Passover season (cf. Le Déaut, *Introduction*, 163), with perhaps an echo of the Bethlehem children. The θαυμάσια of 21:14-15 are the messianic, Davidic cures of 11:2 and 5 (above p. 181, n. 4). Further in Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ*, 182-186. According to the *Temple Scroll*, which seems to purport to be the missing Davidic torah of 1 Chron 28:11, in the last age the lepers and the maimed will be forbidden to enter the Temple. Cf. Y. Yadin, "The Temple Scroll," *BA* 30 (1967) 135-39, 137-139. Interestingly, the 12,000 soldiers of the Messiah hate unjust gain, and protect him from the Gentiles - contrast Mt 26:53; 26:15 and 27:3-10; 20:19parr.

2 "Hosanna" in 21:9 and 15 may retain a note of appeal, yielding a lamentation pattern - W. Brueggemann, "From Hurt to Joy, From Death to Life," *Int* 28 (1974) 3-19, 18-19: Lament v. 9/Salvation 12-14/Praise 15-16.

3 A. T. Hanson, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1965) 42, 153. For Jesus the royal lawgiver and teacher see F. J. Moloney, "The Targum on Ps. 8 and the New Testament," *Sal[esianum]* 37 (1975) 326-336.

4 On συνάγω in Mt see n. 1 on p. 88.

asserting his royal authority.[1] "But he is not merely David *redivivus*; the Son of David (as already hinted in the parables, 21^{37}, 22^{2}) is also Son of God (see Chap. I). The Jews' inability to answer is for Mt an inability to accept Christ for what he really is."[2]

But the question about David's Son has to be viewed in the context of the whole Gospel. Where the *crowd* show some understanding of the healing Son of David, there is each time an objection from the authorities, 12:24 and 21:15-16. According to 12:24-32 the Pharisees do not detect the Spirit of God at work in Jesus. The Davidic Son of God (Isaiah 7:14 in the context of Matthew 1:20-23) is the creation of the Spirit. Only when he is grasped as Emmanuel can he be accepted as the saving Son of David.[3] There are three episodes where *individuals* address Jesus as Son of David: the blind pair in 9:27-31; the Canaanite woman, 15:21-28; and the two blind men of Jericho, 20:29-34. On each occasion the Son of David is also termed "Lord," the word of the disciple; and, extraordinarily, Jesus awaits a second request before healing.[4] Moreover, the faith of the petitioner is assessed (9:28; 15:26; 20:31-32), a faith that expects mercy from the Son of David who is Lord.[5] Thus Davidic and divine sonship are coordinated, and mutually interpretative.[6]

---

1 As he did in the guise of David in 12:1-8, being greater than Solomon (12:42). On this pericope see F. Neirynck, "Jesus and the Sabbath. Some Observations on Mk II,27," *Jésus aux origines*, 227-270, esp. pp. 266-267; E. Levine, "The Sabbath Controversy according to Matthew," *NTS* 22 (1975/76) 480-483, who sees the episode in halakic terms - "Jesus is challenging the status of the *Temple*; he is not questioning the status of the *Torah*" (p. 482). This conclusion fits Mt 21:12-16 and 22:41-46, if one widens torah to include Isa and Jer in 21:13 and Pss 8, 110, and 118.

2 Green, *Matthew*, 186. See further below in (i) and (j).

3 Suhl, "Davidssohn," 70-71, 75, 76, 81.

4 Suhl, pp. 73-75; Kingsbury, "Son of David," 599.

5 This coheres with Mt's insistence on the mercy of the Shepherd-Servant-King (see p. 178 with n. 1). Ἐλέησον is found four times with Son of David, and only once elsewhere (17:15). Note σπλαγχνισθεὶς in 20:34.

6 Of course Son of David is explained not only in the light of 1:20-23 and the cures. Jesus answers his own question of 22:45 in replying to Caiaphas, 26:63-64; cf. Neugebauer, "Davidssohnfrage," 84, 106-107, who also relates the Son of David to the royal Adam (pp. 99-101) and Son of Man. Further detailed observations are found in the fine study by Jack Dean Kingsbury, "Son of David." However, he does not take sufficient account of the interpenetration of titles, or of the spiritual image of David.

(i) *Matthew 21(:33-46): The "Stone"-Son, Heir to the Vineyard.* - Matthew's version of the parable of the murdered son and heir brings out the royal aspect with its mention of the Kingdom of God and an obedient people (verse 43), and perhaps also by speaking of the οἰκοδεσπότης in verse 33, and laying stress on the stone in verse 44. For him the parable is a royal genre (13:35), and it is interesting to note that he uses the word in the plural in verse 45. Οἰκοδεσπότης is not found in the Septuagint or Josephus, but it occurs seven times in Matthew, with only one parallel in Luke, and none in Mark. The owner of the house of the Supper is anonymous in Matthew 26:18, but the οἰκοδεσπότης in Mark 14:14 (hapax) and Luke 22:11. The householder of Luke 14:21 has a king for counterpart in Matthew 22:7. All six uses of the noun in Matthew's special material point to a ruler. It applies to Jesus in 10:25 (where a play on words makes Beelzebul master of the hostile household) and 13:27, and to God in 20:1, 11 and 21:33 In the remaining case, 13:52, it seems to be transferred to Christians who have become like their Master through being discipled to the Kingdom of heaven.[1] In each case the evangelist appears to be stressing the reality of the οἶκος, the community of the disciples, the οἰκιακοί of 10:25 and 36 (Judas?), the δοῦλοι of whom God or the Christ is the δεσπότης.[2] Matthew alone declares that the vineyard is the kingdom. The Chronicler repeatedly states that David or Solomon presided over the kingdom of Yahweh. In short, the terms parable, master of the house, and kingdom of heaven could have a Davidic resonance for Matthew. This possibility is enhanced by three elements common to the Synoptic tradition which are connected with the Davidids: the *vineyard*, the *son and heir*, and the *stone*.

α. The Vine of David: The vineyard is a not uncommon symbol for Israel in the Old Testament.[3] Therefore it is hardly surprising that it is also associated with the House of David. The messianic Genesis 49:11 speaks of

---

1 See K. H. Rengstorf, "δεσπότης, οἰκοδεσπότης," *TDNT* 2 (1964 [German 1935]) 44-49, 48-49; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 68-69, and notes; J. Reumann, "'Jesus the Steward.' An Overlooked Theme in Christology," *SE* V (Berlin, 1968) 21-29, esp. pp. 24-25, 27-28.

2 For the centrality of the relationship between king and servant in several of Mt's parables see the table in Thompson, *Matthew's Advice*, 210. - Could this be at the root of the Davidid δεσπόσυνοι?

3 Examples cited by J. Behm, "ἄμπελος," *TDNT* 1 (1964 [German 1933]) 342; add Jer 6:9; 8:13; 12:10, "Many shepherds have destroyed my vineyard."

Judah binding "his ass's colt to the choice vine." Whatever the literal meaning of this "Blessing" of Jacob,[1] royal Judah is linked with lion and sceptre (49:10), with mule and vine, and with flocks (49:12). The lion, the vine, and the sceptre recur in the royal elegy of Ezekiel 19. A third coupling of the vine and David may be concealed in the song of Isaiah 5:1-7 about the vineyard, cited in Matthew 21:33. The last verse has an obvious play on words: ויקו למשפט והנה משפח / לצדקה והנה צעקה. The song's opening line may also be a pun. Remembering that Solomon is Jedidiah, and that Isaiah's spelling of David is identical with "beloved" (דוד),[2] it yields another monarchist sense:

אשירה נא לידידי שירת דודי לכרמו

Ἄισω δὴ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἆσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου.

This may be rendered: "Let me sing for my loved one (Solomon) the song of my beloved (David) about his vineyard (Israel)." Solomon inherits the vineyard when he inherits the throne!

These three texts show that the ruling house of Judah was associated with the vine(yard). Indeed, the offshoot (צמח) and branch (נצר) of David awaited by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah may refer to the vinestock and tendril of the royal dynasty in the heart of the vineyard Israel. Nathan's oracle contains an assurance that Yahweh will plant (καταφυτεύσω, 2 Samuel 7:10) Israel in its own place. This planting of the vine Israel goes hand

---

1 C. M. Carmichael ("Some Sayings in Genesis 49," *JBL* 88 [1969] 435-444) argues that Gen 49:8-12 is condemnatory and ironical, with the vine standing for the continuity of the line of Judah. With minimal consonantal changes Gen 49:10 can be translated, "Unto thee (Judah) shall come the son-of-Jesse to become a community of nations (i.e. Empire)" according to B. Margulis, "Gen. XLIX 10/Deut. XXXIII 2-3," *VT* 19 (1969) 202-210, 203. Both hypotheses support the claim being made here, although the latter is deemed an "abenteuerliche Konjektur" by J. Becker, *Messiaserwartung im Alten Testament* (Stuttgart, 1977) 30 n. 9.

2 The name David is pre-biblical, and reportedly found in the Ebla archives. Its derivation is uncertain, as shown by the range of opinion in J. Mauchline, *1 and 2 Samuel* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1971) 129-130. The frequent linking of David with beloved (*dwd/dôd*) is at least acceptable as a folk etymology; see A. Hoffmann, *David. Namensdeutung zur Wesensdeutung* (BWANT 100; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973). The reality is in 2 Sam 22:20 and Ps 18:20 - "he delighted in me." In an "uncharacteristic rabbinic passage" the *ʿAbot R. Nat.* says the messianic king is more beloved than the anointed priest: G. J. Blidstein, "A Rabbinic Reaction to the Messianic Doctrine of the Scrolls?," *JBL* 90 (1971) 330-332, 330. Cf. above p. 170 n. 3; and Martin, "Shepherd," 272.

in hand with building the house of the Lord, Exodus 15:17; 2 Maccabees 1:29; also, Ezekiel 17:7-8, 22-23. This pairing springs from the process of sedentarization, which entails building a home and planting (a vine): Deuteronomy 6:11; Joshua 24:13; Jeremiah 1:10. The finale of Amos, 9:11-15, echoes Nathan's linking of the planting of Israel with the divine building of a "house" for David. Significantly, Asaph's Psalm 80 (compare Jeremiah 12:10) implores the Shepherd of Israel to have regard for the vine his right hand has planted, thereby accentuating the latter's dynastic symbolism. Consequently, it is not capricious to refer to royal Asaph in connection with Matthew's parable of the vineyard of the Master of the house, which is the kingdom of heaven.[1] Certainly this psalm is but one of several texts drawn on by the parable. But adverting to it highlights the importance to Matthew of the attitude of soul nurtured by David's psalter.

In view of the foregoing it is not surprising that in the first christian century the vine was associated with Judaism, the Temple, and the Messiah.[2] The vineleaf appears on the coinage of liberated Jerusalem, thus

---

1 The targum discerns the King Messiah in the vine and son of man of Ps 80:14, 17; cf. Black, "Christological Use" (see p. 52, n. 2), 13-14 n. 3. The house of David and the plantation (vine) interpenetrate here as well as in 2 Sam 7. D. Hill traces the Davidic promise background of Ps 80, and also equates the son of man with the royal Messiah, in "'Son of Man' in Psalm 80 v. 17," *NovT* 15 (1973) 261-269; compare Moule, *Origin*, 24-28. A regal son of man in the Gospels and Heb is proposed by G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* (AB 36; New York: Doubleday, 1972) 38-51. Walter Wifall, in a series of articles, uses the ideology of sacral kingship to equate the Davidic monarch with the First Man and the Son of Man (Adam): "David: Prototype of Israel's Future?," *BTB* 4 (1974) 94-107, 103-107; "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 237-240; "Gen 3:15 - A Protevangelium?," *CBQ* 36, 361-365; "Son of Man - A Pre-Davidic Social Class?," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 331-340, 336-340. If this promising approach is valid, it would multiply Davidic references in the Synoptics. See further, Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 56-66; K. Müller as in n. 3 on p. 174; T. K. Thordarson, "The mythic dimension," *VT* 24 (1974) 212-220, 218-219.

2 R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (AB 29A; New York: Doubleday, 1970) 674; also, J. P. Brown, "The Mediterranean Vocabulary of the Vine," *VT* 19 (1969) 146-170, esp. pp. 150, 161-164, 168-170; Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 271-276; M. Hubaut, "La parabole des vignerons homicides: son authenticité, sa visée première," *RTL* 6 (1975) 51-61, 58-59, who points out that the targum identifies the vineyard tower with the Temple. Note 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 39:7, "The Dominion of my Messiah, which is like a vine"; *Ascension of Isaiah* 4:2-3, "A lawless king will persecute the plant which the Twelve Apostles of the Beloved have planted"; and, much later, R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study in Early Syriac Tradition* (Cambridge: University Press, 1975) 95-130, esp. p. 117.

hinting at a nationalistic, "messianic" connotation. But one testimony from about the time of the composition of Matthew is of prime importance. The *Didache* gives a eucharistic prayer which includes the following thanksgiving over the cup: "We give thee thanks, Our Father, for the Holy Vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy Servant." And the service concludes with, "May Grace come, and this world pass away! Hosanna to the God of David! Marana tha! Amen."[1]

A liturgical text written, or at least copied, as late as the end of the sixth century still has: [καθ]ως ἡ οἰνος ο[ὑτος] ὁ ἐχελθων ἐκ τη[ς ἁγιας ἀ]μπελου 'Δ'[αυειδ].[2] Therefore the *Didache* vision of the Church as the House and Vine of David (and, presumably, the New Temple) is scarcely a peculiar development among a splinter group of the Great Church.[3] The Book of Revelation may reflect a similar ecclesiology.[4] David's covenant and

---

1 See J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè. Instruction des apôtres* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1958), whose dating of 50-70 A.D. (p. 199) is generally held to be twenty years too early. The work reflects a milieu not dissimilar from that of Mt (pp. 200-203, etc.). The citations are from *Did.* 9:2 and 10:6 in the translation of J. A. Kleist, *The Didache* (ACW 6; London: Longmans, Green, 1948) 20-21, and cf. his nn. 55, 60, 66-68 on pp. 160-161. Parallels include Origen, *Hom. (in Jud.)* 6:2, "antequam verae vitis, quae ascendit de radice David, sanguine inebriemur." Cf. further J. Daniélou, *RSR* 59 (1971) 39-40.

2 C. H. Roberts and B. Capelle, *An Early Euchologium. The Dêr-Balizeh Papyrus Enlarged and Reedited* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, XXIII; Louvain, 1949) 26-27, 52. It may reproduce an anaphora of the Alexandrian type according to J. Van Haelst, "Une nouvelle reconstitution du Papyrus liturgique de Dêr-Balizeh," *ETL* 45 (1969) 444-455.

3 B. Bagatti ("Le origini delle tradizioni dei luoghi santi in Palestina," *SBFLA* 14 [1964] 32-64) believes the *Didache* represents a milieu governed by the relatives of the Lord, and notes that some codices have "Hosanna to the House of David" at 10:6 (p. 39). Although the *Didache* may regard the Church as the House of David, that does not mean that the third century Palestinian reading, "Hosanna to the House of David," at Mt 21:15 is synonymous with "Hosanna to the Temple/Church" (against Audet, *Didachè*, 63-67, also p. 422; with J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* [NT Library; London: SCM, 1966] 254 n. 1, who points out that the Temple is never called the House of David). Yet Qumran demonstrates that the "house" of 2 Sam 7, which is both the Temple and the family of David, could be identified with a community; cf. Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 159-168. In the *Didache* the "Vine of David" means the Church rather than the Messiah: A. Vööbus, *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache* (Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 16; Stockholm: ETSE, 1968) 124-126.

4 Babylon inebriates the world with the wine of her fornication-idolatry, Rev 14:8; 16:19. She is drunk with the blood of the martyrs, 17:2-6; 18:3, 24. But her judgment is a scene of vintage, and the King of Kings

graces are fulfilled in the Eucharistic blood.[1] This complex of ideas centred on the vine(yard) of David draws together elements which do not, at first sight, seem to be related: the love of God; the Son; the Lordship of the Son of David - King, *Mar*, *despotēs*, *desposunoi*, *ekklēsia*; the New Covenant in his blood, the Eucharist; perhaps even the son of man.

β. The Son and Heir: These ideas are frequently coupled in the New Testament (e.g., Romans 8:17; Galatians 3:29; 4:7; Hebrews 1:2), but only rarely in the Old Testament or Late Judaism.[2] The significant passage is Psalm 2:7-8: "I will tell you of the decree (חק) of the Lord: he said to me, 'You are my *son*, today I have begotten you. Ask of me and I will make the nations your *heritage*, and the ends of the earth your possession.'" At his coronation the Davidic monarch is legitimated as the guardian of Zion.[3] Concomitantly he is appointed sovereign over Israel, the private property or *s^{e}gullah* (סגלה, Exodus 19:5) and inheritance of Yahweh. Such a responsibility makes the succeeding Davidid son and heir to Yahweh.[4] Since, in principle, Yahweh holds sway over the whole world from his throne in Zion, the king is ideally emperor of the cosmos, the pantocrator of Psalm 89. The *ḥoq* or *Königsprotokoll*[5] making the Davidic monarch the son and heir of

---

treads out the winepress, 14:14-20; 19:15-16. This king is the root and scion of David, 22:16. The motifs of Mt's parable recur: Davidic king, owner of vineyard, bloodshed, judgment. In a sense, Rev tells the parable of the wicked vinedressers on a different, apocalyptic, register. The closing verses of the book echo the *Did.* invocations - 22:16-20; cf. P. Prigent, "Une trace de liturgie judéo-chrétienne dans le chapitre XXI de l'Apocalypse de Jean," *RSR* 60 (1972) 165-172, esp. pp 166-167.

1 More in Lohmeyer, *Gottesknecht und Davidsohn*, 27-33.

2 W. Foerster, "κληρονόμος," *TDNT* 3 (1965 [German 1938]) 767-785, 781-782.

3 See n. 5 on p. 181; H. Seebass, "*bāchar*," *TDOT* 2 (1975) 73-87, 81-82; Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 305-306.

4 G. Fohrer, "υἱός," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 344-345, 350-352; H. Gese, "Natus ex virgine," *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (ed. H. W. Wolff) 73-89, 78-81. Κληρονόμος occurs only six times in the OT, so it is not surprising that the king is never explicitly called "the heir". But Saul is anointed ruler over the inheritance of Yahweh in 1 Sam 10:1; and the schismatic rallying cry shows how the Davidid was the guardian of the inheritance of Israel, the heir par excellence: "What portion have we in David? We have no inheritance in the son of Jesse" (1 Kgs 12:16; 2 Chron 10:16).

5 On which see G. H. Jones, "'The decree of Yahweh' (Ps. II 7)," *VT* 15 (1965) 336-344, with the references in n. 3 on p. 340 to G. von Rad, S. Mowinckel, and R. de Vaux; Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 286-287; Eaton, *Psalms*, 111-112, 146. More generally, consult Ishida, *Royal Dynasties*, 81-150, e.g. pp. 108-117, 127-136.

Yahweh is cherished even as late as the two centuries preceding Christ. The Septuagint of Sirach 47:11 mentions the Lord's royal covenant (διαθήκη βασιλέων) with David. The Hebrew has "decree of kingship" (חוק ממלכת), the "rights of royalty" (NAB). Later still, 4Q *Patriarchal Blessings* understands the מחקק ("staff," *mᵉḥoqēq*) of Genesis 49:10 as "the covenant of the kingship." Apparently Qumran identifies it as the divine decree regarding the Davidic kings, *mᵉḥuqqāq*. God will be faithful to his decree concerning (or gracious promise to, or covenant with) the House of David.[1] It is this vista of faith in the divine sonship and inheritance of the universe guaranteed to the king at Jerusalem which makes the Davidic strain so vital to the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke.[2]

γ. The "Stone"-Son: As well as the Davidic vineyard and son and heir, the stone in Matthew 21:42(parallels) and 21:44 can have a messianic meaning. Three aspects may be distinguished: the stone as cipher for the Son of David; the royal foundation stone of the Temple-Church; and the stone which seals the gates of Hell. The "stone"-son is used apologetically as the stone of stumbling (Isaiah 8:14), the rejected but divinely elected stone of Psalm 118:22-23, and the stone uncut by human hand which expands to dominate the earth in Daniel 2:34, 44-45.[3] Clearly this trio illuminates the passion, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus. More than this,

---

1 For this explanation of *mḥqq* see Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 65-66, 73-74; L. C. Allen, "The Old Testament Background of (ΠΡΟ)ΟΡΙΖΕΙΝ in the New Testament," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 104-108, 104. The covenant with David, as it affects Acts and the New Testament in general, has been studied in some detail by Lövestam, pp. 13-15, 21-23, 60-66, 72-74, and passim. Allen examines Rom 1:4, Acts 2:23 and 10:42 in the light of Ps 2. He reasserts the late Jewish and NT association of Isa 11(:4) and Ps 2(:9) in, for example, Rev 19:15. The OT development of the covenant with David is sketched by McCarthy, *OT Covenant*, 45-52, 80-85; Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," 189-192.

2 The NT vitality of the Davidic faith has been treated by many authors already cited, among them L. C. Allen, K. Berger, C. Burger, M.-A. Chevallier, D. C. Duling, M. Dumais, E. Lohmeyer, E. Lohse, E. Lövestam, E. Schweizer, L. S. Thornton, W. Wifall.

3 On the NT stone texts consult Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 41-43; J. Jeremias, "λίθος," *TDNT* 4 (1967 [German 1942]) 268-280, esp. pp. 272-276; O. Cullmann, "πέτρα," *TDNT* 6 (1968 [German 1959]) 95-99. The polemic aspect is investigated by Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 169-186. The christological significance of the Isaianic and Ps 118 texts is probed by Longenecker, *Christology*, 50-53. None of these authors discerns the texts' importance for Davidic messianism. See also the following notes.

each of the three texts has a Davidic slant. Isaiah 8:14 is preceded by "Immanuel" in 8:8 and 10; and is in a supremely royal and messianic context, Isaiah 6-11. The Targum to Psalm 118:22 (the verse cited in Matthew 21:42parallels) interprets the rejected stone as the youngest of the sons of Jesse, who was not summoned when Samuel came to anoint the new king. Pseudo-Philo is another early witness to the passing over by men of the stripling David (see page 167). Matthew Black gives grounds for thinking the author of Daniel 2:34, 44-45, was speaking figuratively of the son of David who would rule the world, or at least of the son of Man of Daniel 7, who may be an alias for the royal Messiah.[1] Therefore, for Matthew's audience the allusion in 21:43-44 to Daniel 2:44 and 7:27 would impregnate the passage with a Davidic tincture.

A second metaphor is that of the foundation stone of Isaiah 28:16 and Zechariah 3:8-9 and 4:7-10. Zechariah 3:8-9 reads, in part, "Behold, I will bring my servant the Branch (צמח). For behold, upon the stone which I have set before Joshua, upon a single stone with seven facets,[2] I will engrave its inscription, says the Lord of hosts, and I will remove the guilt of this land in a single day."[3] Here the foundation stone is clearly

---

1 "Christological Use," 12-13; also Müller, "Menschensohn und Messias," 65-66; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 463-464; J. Duncan M. Derrett, "'The Stone that the Builders Rejected'," *SE* IV (Berlin, 1968) 180-186, 183-185.

2 Good grounds for rendering Zech 3:9 עין by "well" or "stream" instead of "facet" are given by E. Lipiński, "Recherches sur le livre de Zacharie," *VT* 20 (1970) 25-55. This is reminiscent of the water-spouting rock of the wilderness period, Ex 17:6; Num 20:7-11. Again there is the river of living water to flow from out Jerusalem or from under the Temple, Zech 14:8; Ezek 47:1; Joel 4:18 (Lipiński, pp. 25-30). This rock appears in 1 Cor 10:4; and the stream flows from Christ himself in Jn 7:37-38 and 19:34, and from the throne of God and the royal Lamb in Rev 22:1. Therefore it is entirely possible that Jewish tradition in NT times was familiar with a pierced Temple foundation stone, from whose seven orifices would spurt the waters of life in the messianic age. Jesus Christ crucified was that stone. Zech 12:10 and 12 has the transfixing of the beloved in a Davidic context, universal mourning, and (in 13:1) a fountain of purification for the House of David and Jerusalem. The image of the pierced shepherd is latent in the appearance of the sign of the son of Man in Mt 24:30 (cf. the seeing of 26:64par.); see Martin, "Shepherd," 290.

3 A consistent and convincing exegesis of Zech 3:6-10 is given by A. Petitjean, "La Mission de Zorobabel et la Reconstruction du Temple. *Zach.*, III,8-10," *ETL* 42 (1966) 40-71. The Branch is the legitimate heir (Zerubbabel) who founds a sanctuary, and inaugurates a new era of wellbeing.

related to the Temple and the Davidic king. The same combination occurs in Zechariah 4:6-10, where Zerubbabel lays the "first stone" of the post-Exilic Temple.[1] The seer of Revelation 5:5-6 takes up this connection between the Davidic Branch and the stone with the seven "eyes." John speaks of the lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, the Lamb with seven eyes which are the seven spirits of God ranging through the whole earth. The personifcation of the stone follows a long tradition of capitalizing on the word play between stone (אבן, *'eben*) and son (בן, *ben*). Even in the absence of these words the idea can be present, as in Isaiah 51:1-2: "Look to the rock from which you were hewn . . . Look to Abraham your father."[2] The same pun appears in Matthew 3:9 and Luke 3:8, "God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham"; 16:18, "On this rock I will build [raise up children] my church."[3] In Zechariah 9:13 and 16 may be noted the easy transition from son to stone or jewel. The Septuagint renders the "first stone" of Zechariah 4:7 by the "stone of inheritance" (λίθον τῆς κληρονομίας), indicating that the translator understood the stone to be a cipher for the Davidic son and heir.[4] Consequently, the foundation stone of the New Temple is incarnated in the Son of David.

---

1 Lipiński ("Recherches sur Zacharie," 30-33) explains the first stone of Zech 4:7 as one taken by the king from the ruins of the old temple, and incorporated as the foundation stone of the new one. This solves the question of whether a copestone or a foundation stone is inserted. The stone is "first" in the sense of coming from the former building, rather than in the sense of crowning the finished structure. Further support is given by the *Testament of Solomon* 22:7 and 23:3b, as cited by H.-J. Klauck, "Das Gleichnis vom Mord im Weinberg (Mk 12,1-12; Mt 21,33-46; Lk 20:9-19)," *BibLeb* 11 (1970) 118-145, 126 n. 27.

2 Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 41 n. 2; J. Massingberd Ford, "'Thou art "Abraham" and Upon This Rock . . .'," *HeyJ* 6 (1965) 289-301; Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 203-204. Examples of this son/stone wordplay include 1 Kgs 18:31; Lam 4:1-2; Isa 54:11-13.

3 See Massingberd Ford in preceding note. This deliberate ambiguity of "building" a house-temple or house-family (although found, significantly, in 2 Sam 7:12-16) hardly provides a total explanation of Mt 16:18a. See further Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 213-229, esp. pp. 223-227; Kahmann, "Verheissung an Petrus," 264-269; also, G. Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (SNTSMS 22; Cambridge: University Press, 1974) 73-81.

4 Cf. E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (New Century Bible; London: Nelson, 1966) 223 (on Lk 20:17); Black, "Christological Use," 11-14; A. Jaubert, "Symboles et figures christologiques dans le judaïsme," *RSR* 47 (1973) 373-390, 374-376; M. Wilcox, "Peter and the Rock," *NTS* 22 (1975/76) 84-87.

There is, thirdly, a complex and doubtless esoteric connection between the stone designated by God and the Temple built by the Son of David. The foregoing texts of Zechariah were probably the spur to the later mystic speculation about the Jerusalem Temple being the navel of the earth, with its foundation stone serving to seal the abyss of chaos.[1] According to rabbinic legend, David arrested the surging primeval flood by an inscription on the foundation stone of the Temple, which stopped up the gates to the underworld. Matthew 16:18 presumably alludes to such a tradition with its assurance, "the gates of Hades shall not prevail" against the church.[2] This third nuance of stone relates to the founding of the messianic community in the face of opposition; compare Matthew 21:41-45. It is noteworthy that all three strands of the New Testament stone imagery intertwine in the royal theology. It is the Son of David who quells the powers of Hades by building his church, or living Temple, on the rejected but vindicated stone that is himself, and on the rock of his Eliakim-like steward, Peter. This Son is heir to all things by submitting to the rejection of the cross and rising to enthronement.

(j) *Matthew 22(:1-14) and 25(:1-13): The Bridegroom of Israel.* - Another Davidic theme, which may be common to Matthew, Revelation, and Ephesians 5, is the Old Testament portrayal of the monarch as the kinsman and husband of the People. For this see 2 Samuel 5:1; 17:3, "I will bring all the people back to you as a bride comes home to her husband" (note 16: 21-22); 19:12-13.[3] All four Gospels have an isolated saying about the joy accompanying the bridegroom Jesus, namely, Matthew 9:15 and parallels. At

---

1 On the *Eben Shetiyah*, the foundation stone of the Temple and the keystone of the underworld, see R. Patai, *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (2d ed. [1st 1947]; New York: KTAV, 1967) 57-58, 85-86; Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ*, 177-181; D. Sperber, "On Sealing the Abysses," *JSS* 11 (1966) 168-174, esp. p. 169; J. Massingberd Ford, "The Jewel of Discernment. (A study of stone symbolism)," *BZ* 11 (1967) 109-116; R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: University Press, 1969) 188-194; Terrien, "Omphalos Myth" (p. 42 n. 3), 322-323 n. 5; N. Hillyer, "'Rock-Stone' Imagery in I Peter," *TyndB* 22 (1971) 58-81; Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 239-245; P. Schäfer, "Tempel und Schöpfung. Zur Interpretation einiger Heiligtumstraditionen in der rabbinischen Literatur," *Kair* N.F. 16 (1974) 122-133, 123-128.

2 Cf. Cullmann, "πέτρα," 96; and McKelvey and Fawcett in preceding note.

3 W. Brueggemann, "Of the same flesh and bone (Gn 2,23a)," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 532-542.

least part of the background to this picture is the idea of the Son of David joining himself in everlasting love to messianic Israel.[1] The nuptials between the Lamb and the Church in Revelation 19:9 and 21:2, 9-10 are prepared by millenia of religious experience.[2] Moreover, this is a Davidic marriage, since the seer can say the Lamb will be a shepherd (7:17), and several times implies that this Shepherd and King of Kings is the Son of David, whose wedding with the new Jerusalem is being fêted, 5:5-6, 22:16-17. Into this context fits the Sinaiticus crossheading in the epithalamium of the son of David, in verses mentioning vineyards and shepherding: προς τον νυμφιον χριστον (Song 1:7). The notion of the Davidic king being wed to Israel would provide a uniformly intelligible explanation of the gospel bridegroom saying, of Ephesians 5:21-33, and of Revelation 19-22.[3] It could also shed fresh light on the Matthean parables of the *royal* marriage (22:1-14) and the ten bridesmaids (25:1-13).[4] This topic is treated in quite exuberant fashion in "Davidic" poetry almost contemporary with Matthew, the *Odes of Solomon* 3; 38:11, "The Beloved and his Bride"; 42:8-9.[5] In this view the Kingdom is characterized as a banquet celebrating the union of the Son of David, beloved Son of God, with the obedient faithful.

---

1 The Baptist's refusal to remove the sandal of Jesus in Mt 3:11parr shows that the true bridegroom of Israel has come: Howton, "'Son of God'," 231 n. 1 (see below p. 219 n. 1); P. Proulx and L. Alonso Schökel, "Las Sandalias del Mesías Esposo," *Bib* 59 (1978) 1-37, esp. p. 29 n. 19, 33-35. It is thought-provoking that the same rite of kingship-marriage persists among an Indo-European people who had been christian for fully eight centuries, according to the *Annals of Connacht* for 1310 A.D. See F. J. Byrne, *Irish Kings and High-Kings* (London: Batsford, 1973) 16-17.

2 A. Fitzgerald, "The Mythological Background for the Presentation of Jerusalem as a Queen and False Worship as Adultery in the Old Testament," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 403-416. On Ps 45 see Eaton, *Psalms*, 119. Yahweh describes his Temple in phrases applied to Ezekiel's wife: "the pride of your power, the delight of your eyes, and the desire of your soul" (Ezek 24:21). In the Old as well as the New economy the Temple/Church can be presented in terms of a person who is "one flesh" with a man/The Man.

3 Also cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Black's NT Commentaries; London: Black, 1973) 272-273.

4 On the royal aspect see Beskow, *Rex Gloriae*, 68-70; Radermakers, *Matthieu*, 278-279 (citing E. Haulotte on the "habit du cour").

5 See J. H. Charlesworth, ed. and transl., *The Odes of Solomon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973) 18-20, 131-134, 144-145. Note also Israel's being born from Adam's side in *Bib. Ant.* 32:15. On the Church as Bride see Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 301-311; Murray, *Symbols*, 131-142.

(k) *Matthew 26-27: The King is Dead!* - α. The Christ must Suffer: Since Nils Alstrup Dahl's 1960 study, "The Crucified Messiah,"[1] the political charge against Jesus of ambitioning the kingship has regained its central position. The paradox of "Christ"-ianity is that the Messiah, the King, underwent the *supremum ac servile supplicium* of the cross.[2] Therefore it must be kept in mind that on its most matter-of-fact level the Matthean Passion story concerns a King who would reform his Temple and be acknowledged as the Son of God.[3] The special interests of Matthew in chapters 26-27 have frequently been analyzed. The evangelist presents Jesus as a majestic figure wholly in command of the situation, voluntarily carrying out the will of his Father, and aware of the details of his destiny.[4] The path of Matthew's hieratic Lord is tinged with a glory almost extinguished in Mark. He is every inch a King, a Prophet-King. But the divine necessity of his suffering (26:54) requires further elucidation.

---

1 Reprinted with slight additions and a postscript in his *The Crucified Messiah and other essays* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974) 10-36, 161-166. One of his students, Donald Juel, has explored in Mk the expectation that the Messiah would build a new temple (*Messiah and Temple*). Equally based on Mk is J. R. Donahue, "Temple, Trial, and Royal Christology," *The Passion in Mark. Studies on Mark 14-16* (ed. W. H. Kelber; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 61-79. On pp. 75-77 Donahue lists Davidic references, including the fact that Peter, James, and John recall David's three generals, two of whom were brothers. In Boismard's *Synopse* many echoes of 1-2 Sam are noted, but mainly in relation to Mk or Lk, e.g., §315, II 3 (p. 377); §317, I 2 (p. 379); §319, 1 (p. 385); §322, 2 (p. 386); §323, 4 (pp. 387-388); §342, I B (p. 405); §346, I 2 (p. 410); §347, I B (p. 416) The similarity of Mk and Mt during the Passion often allows a royal colouring to be identified also in the latter.

2 It would be otiose to rehearse the NT witness to the scandal of the cross. However, the fact that Jesus died as the claimant to the throne, and was preached as crowned after, indeed through, his death as an outcast and blasphemer, has lost much of its shock and starkness. See M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the ancient world and the folly of the message of the cross* (London: SCM, 1977), e.g., pp. 10, 18-21, 62-63, 85-89.

3 "Der Reichstempel war sozusagen der Sitz im Leben der Gottessohnschaft": E. von Nordheim, "König und Tempel. *Der Hintergrund des Tempelbauverbotes in 2 Samuel vii*," *VT* 28 (1977) 434-453, 448. The "broken myth" of the royal Son of God in Jerusalem is conveniently presented by Borsch, *Son of Man*, 106-131.

4 Cf. A. Vanhoye, *Structure and Theology of the Accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1967); A. Descamps in *Mt: Rédaction et théologie*, 359-415, esp. pp. 400-406; M. de Jonge in *Jésus aux origines*, 174-184; Senior, *Passion Narrative*.

β. The Psalms of the Afflicted David: The truly wise man is one who observes the law of the Lord, and thereby incurs the wrath and persecution of the unrighteous. The second chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon has a dozen verses describing the harassment unto death of a just man, of a son of God. There are some twenty possible allusions to this passage in Matthew 11; 22-23; and 26-27.[1] This despised son of God is easily associated with the son of David, Solomon, who speaks very clearly in Wisdom 6-9. David himself already prayed through his sufferings as servant-king in Psalms 18, 22, 49, 69, 86, 88, 89, 116, and 118. Almost all the individual laments of the psalter are *l^eDavid*. It is still an open question how far the servant of Isaiah (note Matthew 8:17 and 12:17-21) and the Davidic messiah are separate concepts in the pre-Christian era.[2] Certainly the agonizing David of the Psalms, along with the beleaguered Solomonic son of God of Wisdom, are poignant forerunners of the crucified Son of David. Around the cross Psalms 22 and 69 spring to life.[3] It is noteworthy that this exposition of the Passion from the psalms of David figures prominently in Acts 1:16-22 (the treachery of Judas); 2:22-36 (the death, resurrection and enthronement of the Son of David); 4:24-30 (the Jewish and Gentile antagonism to Jesus); 13:32-37 (the death and resurrection of the Davidid). In all this recourse to the psalter it should not be forgotten that the

---

1 A very clear table of these correspondences is drawn up by O. Kaiser, *Die ersten drei Evangelien. Einführung in ihre literarische und theologische Gestalt* (Aschaffenburg: Pattloch, 1970) 206-207.

2 For an overall view of the Servant songs see Coppens, *Relève prophétique*, 41-113. He identifies the Servant as the nucleus of the righteous Israelites, heirs of the prophets and the dynastic and levitical covenants (pp. 80, 111-113); and compare Becker, *Messiaserwartung*, 63-65. The royal elements of the Servant are summed up by V. de Leeuw, "Le Serviteur de Jahvé. Figure royale ou prophétique?," *L'attente du Messie* (RechBib I; ed. B. Rigaux; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958) 51-56. Cf. J. A. Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: SCM, 1976) 314-316. Against the pre-Christian merging of the Davidic Messiah and the Servant is also H. H. Rowley, "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah," *The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965 [revised from 1950]) 63-93. However, he agrees with A. R. Johnson that both have a common root in the ritual humiliation of the king which is reflected in some psalms (pp. 91-92). There is no incompatibility between an individual-royal and a community understanding of the Servant and the psalmist. Cf. Beauchamp, "Jésus-Christ," 253-259.

3 J. H. Reumann, "Psalm 22 at the Cross. Lament and Thanksgiving for Jesus Christ," *Int* 28 (1974) 39-58, esp. the schemata on pp. 40-42.

"original justice" of the "servant of God" David was the criterion against which his successors were measured.[1] Second Samuel gives eloquent expression to the notion of David as suffering servant of Yahweh (without using the term), when Absalom expels him from Jerusalem.[2] Moreover, the suffering David patiently accepted redounded to the benefit of the people.[3] The reason that such vestiges of the royal ideology could still irradiate the Matthean Calvary through Psalms 22 and 69 is the simple fact that the psalter introduced the devout to the soul of David, the lamenting and divinely exalted king.[4]

γ. The Passion of the Shepherd King of Zechariah 9-14:[5] The Jerusalem ministry of Jesus made spiritual sense for the Synoptics in the light of

---

1 This theme of the fontal saintliness, the *justitia originalis*, of David is found in 1 Kgs 2:1-4; 3:6; 9:4; 11:12, 32-39; 14:8; 15:3-11; 2 Kgs 8:19; 14:3; . . . 22:2; 2 Chron 6:16; and cf. Bar 2:19. Further in Cross, *Canaanite Myth* (p. 27 n. 1), 281-285; B. C. Birch, *The Rise of the Israelite Monarchy: The Growth and Development of 1 Samuel 7-15* (SBLDS 27; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976) 155-156 n. 9. In Sam-Kgs David is repeatedly called the δοῦλος of Yahweh. He refers to himself as such ten times in his eucharist after the oracle of Nathan, 2 Sam 7:18-29. This usage carries over into the NT at Acts 4:25 (παῖς), also in the context of prayer. On the interrelation of δοῦλος and παῖς see the articles by K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 2 (1964 [1935]) 266; J. Jeremias, *TDNT* 5 (1967 [1954]) 704-705.

2 E.g., 2 Sam 15:25-26, 30-31; 16:11-12. The theology of sacred kingship is detected behind these episodes by Brueggemann, "Kingship and Chaos," esp. pp. 328-331; "Weariness," 19-38. Although he is working from too little material to construct a compelling argument, he has marshalled enough parallels in Gen, the prophets, and the Pss to show the religious, the national, and even the "cosmic" dimensions of the royal passion. A complementary approach to the agony of the Son of David is that of L. C. Allen, "(ΠΡΟ)'ΟΡΙΖΕΙΝ," 104-108. He argues that in the NT the divine decree of Ps 2:7 is extended to the monarch's passion as well as his coronation/resurrection. M. Black ("Christological Use, " 1-14) agrees, and wonders if this decree explains the Synoptic δεῖ asserting the divine necessity of the cross (pp. 3-4).

3 See Brueggemann in the preceding note; and Eaton, *Psalms*, 166-168, 177-181, 190-192, 195-197.

4 Further on pp. 160-165 above. Cf. Cope, *A Scribe Trained*, 102-110, esp. pp. 106-108. On the Pss in the passion see also L. Ruppert, *Jesus als der leidende Gerechte?* (SBS 59; Stuttgart: KBW, 1972) 48-57.

5 Besides the numerous observations of christological import in P. Lamarche, *Zacharie IX-XIV, structure littéraire et messianisme* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1961), see F. F. Bruce, *This is That. The New Testament Development of Some Old Testament Themes* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1968, repr. 1976) 100-114; Martin, "Shepherd," 285-299.

Deutero-Zechariah. This is especially true for Matthew. Whereas the debt to Psalms 22 and 69 is practically confined to Matthew 27:27-48,[1] Second Zechariah contributes to the appreciation of the true King of Zion (21:5 and Zechariah 9:9);[2] the expulsion of the Temple traders (21:12 and 14:21b); the eschatological role of the Mount of Olives (24:3parallels and 14:4a - compare 26:30parallels); the mourning and seeing of the son (24:30 [26:64?; 28:7, 10?] and 12:10-12); the selling of the shepherd for thirty pieces of silver (26:15; 27:3-10 and 11:13); the blood of the covenant (26:28parallel and 9:11; 13:1[?]); the stricken Davidic shepherd and the scattering of his flock at Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives (26:31parallel and 13:7); and the apocalyptic splitting of the earth and the appearance of the holy ones (27:51-52 and 14:4b-5). Deutero-Zechariah remains an enigma because of its allusive richness, tributary alike to Shepherd, Servant, and Davidic King symbols.[3] However, Zechariah 11-13 revolve around a pierced shepherd, who may well be a royal figure, and even a Davidid.[4] Despite the uncertainties Matthew may be held to employ these oracles to convey how Jerusalem could slay the prophet-Son of David and persecute his followers, how his betrayal could be messianic, how the dispersed and the hostile nevertheless have the possibility of repentance and a new covenant with God through beholding the rejected Beloved Son now entered into his reign. This interpretation makes good sense of the prophet's royal, Jerusalem, and universalist elements.

δ. Judas-Ahithophel: In Acts 1:16-20 Judas is identified with the adversary of David in the Passion psalm 69, which is also used in Matthew

---

1 Not to imply that these are the sole psalms enlivening the Jerusalem ministry - Pss 2, 8, 45, 80, and 118 have already been mentioned. Add Pss 41:9 in Mt 26:23; 110:1 at the climax in Mt 26:64.

2 Zech 9 is plausibly identified as a late sixth century version of the ancient Divine Warrior Hymn, preserved in the royal cult, and transmitted by oppressed visionaries, by P. D. Hanson, "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern," *JBL* 92 (1973) 37-59. This study is interesting as a sounding in the tradition history of the Israelite royal theology, e.g., pp. 57-59. On this see further below, pp. 238-240.

3 See the good assessment by Martin, "Shepherd," 298-299. For some of the complexity cf. Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 110-137. Zech 9-14 would become even more relevant to Mt by adopting the exegesis of A. Gelin or G. Gaide synopsized in Coppens, *Messianisme royal*, 214-216; also, K. Seybold, "Spätprophetische Hoffnungen auf die Wiederkunft des davidischen Zeitalters in Sach 9-14," *Judaica* 29 (1973) 99-111, esp. p. 108.

4 Wifall, "David: Prototype," 99-101; R. Tournay, *RB* 81 (1974) 356-369.

27:34 and 48.[1] Matthew uses the Old Testament reminiscences to link the traitor with David: "Ahithophel went off . . . and hanged himself" (2 Samuel 17:23 and Matthew 27:5). There is also the derisory price of the good shepherd, the thirty pieces of silver cast into the treasury of the house of the Lord (Zechariah 11:12-13 and Matthew 27:9-10).[2] Of course Judas is not the focus of interest in the pericope.[3] But Davidic echoes reverberate about him. His role as "one of the Twelve" of identifying Jesus by singling him out from his companions at night is precisely that of Ahithophel in 2 Samuel 17:1-2 (compare Matthew 26:48-49, and the flight of his supporters in verse 56b). The treacherous kiss of Judas resembles Joab's lethal embrace of Amasa. David commanded Solomon to kill this false member of his circle because of that blood guilt, 2 Samuel 20:9 and 1 Kings 2:5-6 (Matthew 26:49). The similarity of David's ἡμάρτηκα (2 Samuel 12:13) and Judas' ἥμαρτον (Matthew 27:4) may be fortuitous. Besides Second Samuel, the Psalms foreshadow Judas. Like his ancestor David in Psalm 41:9 Jesus bemoaned the infidelity of a man who shared his table, Matthew 26:23. Another psalm, which Jewish tradition later associated with Ahithophel's malice and violent end, expresses David's sorrow unto death, his "Gethsemane" over a faithless friend, who had once walked in friendship with him in the house of God, but became a man of blood whom God cast down into the lowest pit - Psalm 55:4, 10-11, 13-14, 23.[4] In short Matthew's use of

---

1 J. Dupont, "La destinée de Judas prophetisée par David (Actes 1:16-20)," *CBQ* 25 (1961) 41-51, 50-51; Allen, "(ΠΡΟ)·ΟΡΙΖΕΙΝ," 106; B. Gärtner, *Iscariot* (FBBS 29; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 36-38; T. F. Glasson, "Davidic Links with the Betrayal of Jesus," *ExpT* 85 (1973/74) 118-119; E. Nellessen, "Tradition und Schrift in der Perikope von der Erwählung des Mattias (Apg 1,15-26)," *BZ* 19 (1975) 205-218, 208-211.

2 On the complexities of the quotation in Mt 27:9-10 see Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 84-88, with the reference to P. Benoit in n. 109. According to J. P. Charlier (*The Gospel of the Church's Infancy* [p. 90 n. 2] 88): "Jesus is the new David, persecuted by his own, affirming as well, indirectly, his effective kingship over Israel."

3 His suicide is recounted in just two words, whereas the money is mentioned seven times and the blood three. The blood money condemns both donor and receiver, but shows Jesus carrying out the will of the Father. See Vanhoye, *Passion*, 16-17. On blood guilt in Sam-Kgs see T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. David und die Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Tom. 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975) 19-21, 131.

4 Mt 26:37-38; cf. Gärtner, *Iscariot*, 34-36.

2 Samuel 17, Zechariah 11, and Psalms 41 and 55, evokes the saga of David's triumph over a false friend in a manner reminiscent of the meditative piety of the contemporary Psalm superscriptions. This new Ahithophel serves to highlight the divine purpose in the passion of the King.

(1) *Matthew 28(:16-20): Long Live the King!* - The climactic conclusion of the First Gospel has been variously interpreted against the background of an Ancient Near Eastern enthronement hymn, an Old Testament theophany or revelation, a Church community ruling, or a commissioning of the apostles.[1] The least inadequate analogy is that adduced independently by Bruce J. Malina and Hubert Frankemölle: a royal decree.[2] Both recall how Matthew has modeled the opening of his Gospel on the first nine chapters of Chronicles, the last book of the Hebrew scriptures. Chronicles closes with a decree of the mighty world-king Cyrus commanding the reconstruction of the Temple, and assuring the Jews that their God is with them - 2 Chronicles 36:23. This commission and assurance probably terminated Matthew's Bible. An indication that this passage was in his mind is the the fact that his favourite fulfilment formula has its antecedent in the immediate context, 2 Chronicles 36:21-22.[3] Two further regal overtones may be detected. The risen Christ is the Son, and has been given (ἐδόθη) by the Father all power in heaven and on earth, 28:18. A very credible influence here is the royal protocol of the son and heir, so important in Acts and Romans.[4] Perhaps it was mediated through the very possibly royal son of man of Daniel 7:13-14.[5] Secondly, 2 Chronicles 36:23 seems to be an allusion to Isaiah 44:28 - Cyrus "is my shepherd and he shall fulfil my

---

1 These and other hypotheses are discussed by Hubbard, *Primitive Apostolic Commissioning*, 2-22. His study is assessed by T. Y. Mullins, "New Testament Commission Forms, Especially in Luke-Acts," *JBL* 95 (1976) 603-614; J. P. Meier, "Two Disputed Questions in Matt 28:16-20," *JBL* 96 (1977) 407-424, 416-424 (who rightly eschews the identification of a *Gattung*).

2 Malina, "Literary Structure"; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 42-61. They are evaluated by Mullins, "Commission Forms," 603-604; Meier, "Two Disputed Questions," 418-420.

3 Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 62.

4 See pp. 188-189 above.

5 Further in n. 1 on p. 186; and J. Schreiner, "ימן 'āmats," *TDOT* 1 (1974) 323-327, 324-325; J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 99-102. On Dan in Mt 28:18 see Meier, "Two Disputed Questions," 413-414.

purpose" to rebuild the Temple. The same verse is applied to David in Acts 13:22. Therefore, 2 Chronicles 36:23 could also have a Davidic resonance. Moreover, the homage of 28:17 preceding the universal rule of the Risen One in verses 18b-20a accords with the messianic privilege of Judah in Genesis 49:8-12 to receive the obeisance of his brothers, and to be the ἡγούμενος (compare Matthew 2:6) whom the nations await. The Davidic colouring of the Gospel's final verses is discreet, not to say disputable. Perhaps it does not obtrude for reasons conveyed in Matthew 22:41-46. Yet in view of the thronging royal allusions of the preceding chapters it is quite credible that the Emmanuel, the Son of David, is here granted eternal and worldwide dominion, which is exercised through his disciples.

Summary. - The foregoing thirty pages have focused on Saint David in Matthew 3-28. It was the Davidic covenant grace, and the private persona of David in first century devotion, which helped to mould the Christian character, and gave it a sensitivity and a language to assimilate and address the Son of God who had captivated them. The royal prophet is commissioned at his baptism and transfiguration. More attention could be paid to such traits of the contemporary Son of David as the following: Jesus' proved devotion to the threefold love of Yahweh enjoined in the *Shema*, his Solomonic power of exorcism and healing, his kingly wisdom that moulded disciples, his royal parables that made the Kingdom real and challenging, his concern for the lost sheep of the House of Israel and for the Gentiles. The Davidic Messiah is depicted as "christed" with the Spirit who vanquishes Satan, reveals the Father, and establishes his Kingdom: 3:16-17; 4:1-11; 11:25-30; 12:18-20, 28; 17:5; and possibly 27:50-54. The choice of Peter and the Twelve, the royal banquets, the entry into Jerusalem and lordship of the Temple, the Son in the vineyard, the nuptials of the Christ with his saved people, and the establishing of the covenant in 26:27-29, are all marks of Israel's true king. Again, the Shepherd-King sits in judgment on all the nations, 25:31-46. Moreover, the spiritual commentary of the courtier Isaiah and of the Temple cantor Asaph in Matthew 4-13 and 21, the treachery of the table-companion, and the expressions of anguish, concern and hope from the Songs of David and Deutero-Zechariah, contribute to creating the ethos of the servant-king of prophecy and the sweet singer of Israel. The royal pantocrator of 28:18-20 is equally the vibrant, holy, prophet-king who remains with his people throughout all time.

(iii) *The Son of David in Matthew 1-2.* - It has been shown that Jesus was, according to the accepted criteria of his day, a son of David. Then an outline was given of the mystique of David which fired the religious imagination of devout Jews during the period embracing the life of Jesus and the composition of the New Testament. The immediately preceding pages examined the probable contribution of this Davidic hagiography to the Synoptic tradition, and to Matthew 3-28 in particular. The fact that the evangelist inherited an attitude to Jesus as the prophetico-royal Messiah in no way prevents his exposition of this tradition being subsumed under the heading "Matthean Christology."[1] Specifically Matthean emphases were detected in Jesus' royal parousia in Galilee and towards Sidon, his mission to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, his healing as the Shepherd-Servant Son of David, his kingly parables, his "officials" Peter-Eliakim, Judas-Ahithophel, and "Asaph", his restoration of Zion, his regal authority as the stone-son and heir to the vineyard and kingdom, his passion as the saving king, and his authority as the risen and enthroned. Having sketched this rounded appreciation of the Son of David in Matthew 3-28, it is feasible to evaluate with greater confidence similar traditions in the two opening chapters. Hitherto the Davidic atmosphere of Matthew 1-2 has frequently been noted in regard to the chapters' use of the Old Testament, their sharing of the contemporary interpretation of the star of King Messiah, and the editorial activity of the evangelist.[2] Now the time is ripe to develop and synthesize these disparate observations.

(a) *Matthew's Fulfilment Formula Quotations.* - It is convenient to begin this stage of the investigation with some general observations on the fulfilment formula quotations (henceforth, FFQ), since four out of the ten occur in Matthew 1-2.[3] The citations common to Matthew and Mark are

---

1 Compare p. 170. John parallels the Synoptics' admiration of David the prophet by drawing on Jewish (and Samaritan) blending of royal and prophetic traditions in the figure of Moses, according to W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967), esp. pp. 100-215.

2 For example, pp. 31, 38-47, 60, 78-81, 132, 154-158, 170-200.

3 A consensus on the FFQ is emerging from such studies as, Stendahl, *School*; Gundry, *Use of OT in Matthew*; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*. See also, Cope, *A Scribe Trained*; Brown, *Messiah*, 96-104. Mt 2:5-6 is a FFQ "by adoption" (Soares Prabhu, p. 40).

recognizably Septuagintal. But the FFQ conform to no single extant text type, and range from the Septuagintal to the wholly non-Septuagintal.[1] That Matthew adapted them to their present context, and vice versa, can hardly be doubted.[2]

Characteristics common to the FFQ are that all come from the prophets, principally from Isaiah,[3] and that they have a historico-messianic thrust.[4] They never appear in support of a doctrinal or moral point, and thereby differ from the quotations that prove the resurrection (22:32) or the primacy of love (22:37). The person and mission of the Christ are expounded in a contemplative, didactic, and non-apologetic manner.[5]

The distribution of the FFQ throughout the Gospel is uneven: four (five if 2:5-6 be included) in the pre-baptism cycle; four summaries of the Messiah's work among the needy and outcast before he goes to Jerusalem, all in the words of Isaiah (namely, 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35); and two to mark the Jerusalem events, 21:4-5 and 27:9-10. This pattern almost excludes the possibility of the FFQ having a structural role in the First

---

1 See Gundry, *Use of OT in Matthew*, 89; also, Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 89; Stendahl, *School*, iv, vi; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 104: "free targumic translations made from the original Hebrew by Matthew."

2 Cf. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 57-69; Danieli, "L'influsso reciproco"; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 107-161, etc.; Cope, *A Scribe Trained*, e.g. pp. 45-52, 90; Brown, *Messiah*, 99-101, 149-153, 219-223.

3 This is remarkable in view of the fact that very nearly half of Mt's OT texts come from the Pentateuch. Cf. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 53-55; and n. 2 on p. 177.

4 C. Gancho Hernandez, "Las citaciones del A.T. en los evangelios sinópticos y en los rabinos," *XVII Semana Bíblica Española (1956): Géneros literarios en los evangelios. Otros estudios* (Madrid: Instituto "Francisco Suarez," 1958) 3-82, 58; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 92, 102, 119-120 (133), 147, 182; F. Van Segbroeck, "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents," *Mt: Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier), 107-130, 119, 126-128; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 134-135, 300. Zinniker (*Probleme der sogenannten Kindheitsgeschichte*, 81) concludes about the FFQ: "Sie geben den berichteten Ereignissen *Deutung*, damit man sie im Sinne Gottes versteht, und *Bedeutung*, damit man sie richtig, d.h. nach dem Plane Gottes, wägt und wertet."

5 Compare Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 102, 180; Van Segbroeck, "Les citations d'accomplissement," 129; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 357-358, 385-390; Brown, *Messiah*, 98-99. The establishment of the salvific kingdom of God for Jew and Gentile is their major theme according to J. J. O'Rourke, "The Fulfilment Texts in Matthew," *CBQ* 24 (1962) 394-403, 402.

Gospel. However, they illuminate the career of Jesus as divinely willed and instructive. In the first two chapters is conveyed the workings of providence. Firstly, the crown prince of Judah and Israel is safeguarded from the schemes of a usurper. "There's such divinity doth hedge a king, that treason can but peep to what it would" (*Hamlet* IV.v.123). Secondly, the circumstances of his conception and place of residence befit the true David.

The introductory fulfilment formula (FF) has been ably analyzed by George M. Soares Prabhu.[1] It is the supple instrument, and almost certainly the creation, of the evangelist, who adapts it to each context.[2] The basic form is: Ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος. Each of its three components emphasizes God as the first mover or speaker. "What was spoken" and "be fulfilled" are divine passives; and the prophet is but the instrument of God - διά. Like Jesus himself, the FFQ are resolutely patrocentric.

(b) *Matthew 1:1-17 - The True King.* - Matthew 1 may well stem in its entirety from the hand of the evangelist.[3] The Genealogy of Jesus the Christ shows him to be the son of Abraham and of David. A special concern for Jesus' Abrahamitic origin cannot be verified for the First Gospel.[4] Luke shares the note of universality introduced by Abraham at Matthew 3:9 and 8:11. Abraham, the father of believers, is related to David, the ruler of the whole realm of believers, as promise is to fulfilment. This is the outlook of the Magnificat and Benedictus: Luke 1:54-55 (in the light of the angel's words in 1:31-35), and 1:68-75. Rather than hold that for Matthew the sonship of David is relativized by being part of an arc stretching from Abraham to Christ, it would be more consonant with the evangelist's outlook

---

1 In *Formula Quotations*, 46-63.

2 Cf. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 61-63. On p. 136 it was pointed out that in 2:17 and 27:9 Mt alters Ἵνα to τότε in the FF to avoid ascribing responsibility for man's evil to God. "All this took place" is prefixed to the first and last FF referring directly to Jesus (1:22 and 26:56), as if to say his whole career is fulfilment.

3 See pp. 116-123(131).

4 Note Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 219; C. A. Joachim Pillai, "'Children of Abraham' in the Gospels," *IndJT* 20 (1971) 57-69, esp. pp. 62-63. H. Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 311-314, 319 n. 56) insists that fidelity to the promise alone is in question. But see Brown, *Messiah*, 67-69, 152.

to state that the hope of the Gentiles is realized by the worldwide kingdom of the Son of David anticipated in Genesis 49:10; Psalms 2:8; 89:24-29; 110:6.[1] The Abrahamitic sonship is absorbed into the covenant sonship of David.

The royal Judaean stamp of the genealogy is evident from its succession of Jerusalem monarchs. The emphatic number fourteen probably indicates the gematric equivalent of David.[2] "David *the* king" is the turning point at 1:6 and 17. The "brothers" of Jechoniah may indicate the splintering of the post-exilic descendants of David into many collateral branches stripped of political power, as well as insinuating the solidarity of all Israel. The former nuance is supported by the fact that Jechoniah begets Shealtiel only after the levelling of the deportation to Babylon.[3] The Jerusalem dynasty in its glory and its humiliation prepares for the Son of Man who - like the outcast David - had not where to lay his head, who is cast out of the vineyard (21:39), and mocked during his death agony as King of Israel. The presence of the prophet Amos and the cantor Asaph in verses 8 and 10 further specifies the sort of heir of David who actually is the Messiah. The four women foreshadow the extraordinary manner of the coming or genesis of the Son of David, who is also the Son of God. In sum, the royal Messiah of the genealogy is sprung from God and heir to the world. Like David and Solomon, he has the Spirit of God to heal, to judge, to pray. King Jesus is a servant, a sage, a singer, a sufferer - a saint.

(c) *Matthew 1:18-25 - The Great King.* - These eight verses speak in several voices. First, there is the genesis of *the* Son of David which fulfils prophecy (1:18, 22-23). Then there is the drama of the Davidid of tried obedience who adopts into the royal house the child conceived in Mary of the Holy Spirit (1:19-20, 24-25). Lastly, there is the customary speci-

---

1 Against Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 8; Bornkamm, "The Risen Lord," 226-228. Further in n. 2 on p. 170.

2 Despite the peremptory rejection of such an interest in 1 Chron 1-3 by Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 317-318. See pp. 60-61 above, and Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1: Números*, 65*.

3 Cf. Gutbrod, *Weihnachtsgeschichten*, 34; Benoit and Boismard, *Synopse*, 2. 64: "un déclin, de Salomon à la captivité." Also above, pp. 117-118. Compare the Deuteronomist's special interest in David's posterity at the nadir of their power - E. Zenger, "Die deuteronomistische Interpretation der Rehabilitierung Jojachins," *BZ* 12 (1968) 16-30. Further p. 176 n. 3.

fication of the mission of this child of predilection: "he will save his people from their sins" (1:21). Despite the repeated claims to discern a Mosaic background,[1] there is no single extant literary model for the content of this scene. There are two undeniable royal traits. The origin of the child realizes a dynastic oracle, the Emmanuel of Isaiah 7:14.[2] Secondly, the son conceived and borne by the virgin is incorporated into the line of David. The fact that he will save his people from their sins is not a univocal mark of the Davidic saviour, yet it certainly can suggest Israel's promised king.[3]

(d) *Matthew 2:1-12 - The Universal King.* - Royal messianism is also constitutive of the second chapter. The magi episode has already been shown to be shot through with Davidic theology: the contrast between unbelieving, semi-Jewish, but non-Davidic (Herodian) Jerusalem, and believing, non-Jewish (Magian), but Davidic Bethlehem; the Isaianic παιδίον Servant-King; the royal star of Judah; the queen mother of the Christ; and the fulfilment formula quotation blending Micah 5:1 and 3 with 2 Samuel 5:2, both of which deal with the shepherd-king David.[4]

---

1 These have been evaluated and rejected on pp. 84-89.

2 "St. Matthew's interest lies wholly in presenting Jesus as the predestined King of Israel. This is the purpose of the pedigree which precedes and of the story of the Magi which follows his reference to the Conception, and it is kept well in view in the account of the Conception itself": H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching* (London: Macmillan, 1909) 29. See also Brown, *Messiah*, 159-161, 218 n. 14.

3 Davidic kingship is associated with salvation. The virtuous monarch of Isa 11:1-5 and the royal psalms has no truck with evil (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17:23-30, 35-47, on the Davidic king purifying Israel). The targums to Num 24:7, 17 term the King Messiah a redeemer (פרוקן). The targum to Isa 53 depicts the Messiah in regal imagery: enthronement, political liberation, religious reform, building the Temple, enforcement of the Torah, despoiling of the Gentiles. He is clearly the king who saves from sin. Mt fuses salvation and lordship in two words, "his people," i.e. the people of Jesus the Saviour (note the redemptive import of Joshua-Jesus in Sir 46:1). Compare Lk 2:11; Acts 5:31; 13:22-26, 37-39. The primary source for 1:21 on saving from sin is the Davidic psalm 130:8. See further, Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 85-87; Longenecker, *Christology*, 142-143; Gese, "Natus ex virgine," 77.

4 See pages 38-46 on the OT royal resonance; pp. 74 and 79-81 on the king's star; pp. 174-176, 178 n. 1, 190 n. 2, and 196-197 on the Davidic shepherd. The παιδίον of Isa 7:16, 9:6, 11:6-8, is the root and despised servant of Isa 53:2.

It does not seem to have been remarked before that six major reminiscences of the Old Testament in Matthew 2:1-12 are all related to Davidic messianism. There are two each from the Torah (Genesis 49:10; Numbers 24:17), the Prophets (Former, 2 Samuel 5:2; and Latter, Micah 5:1-3), and the Writings (Psalms 45:8; 72:10-11, 15). These six passages do not exhaust the scriptural resonance, but they produce the dominant tone.

The topic of the Davidic allusions, broached on pages 44-46, may now be expanded. The closest individual text to Matthew 2:10-11 is neither Psalm 72 nor Isaiah 60, but the visit to Hezekiah's treasure house of the envoys of the king of Babylon in Isaiah 39:1-2. Significantly, the parallel account in Second Kings is less similar to Matthew, who very frequently has recourse to the court prophet Isaiah. Isaiah 39:1-2 and Matthew 2:10-11 have five terms in common:
χαίρω χαρὰν μεγάλην, θησαυρός, οἰκία|οἶκος, δῶρα, χρυσός|χρυσίον. They also have three equivalent terms: μάγου|πρέσβεις (both coming from the east), λίβανος|θυμίαμα, μύρον|σμύρνα.[1]

The gospel allusion to the career of Hezekiah in Isaiah 39 conjures up the messianic picture of this king in Judaism. Many commentators have identified the son born to the virgin of Isaiah 7:14 (and Matthew 1:23) as Hezekiah.[2] This understanding is very old, and was combatted vigorously by Justin Martyr; as was the application to Hezekiah of such psalms as 24, which he says applies to Christ Jesus because he has power over demons (*Dialogue with Trypho* 85). Similarly, the humility and later exaltation of

---

1 Comparison of the twin narratives Isa 39:1-2 and 2 Kgs 20:13 in the LXX and Hebrew reveals a flexibility in translation or text which allows the above association between λίβανος and θυμίαμα. Whereas Isa 39:1-2LXX has five precious articles, there are only four in 2 Kgs 20:13LXX, of which but two tally with Isaiah! Hezekiah's treasures are to be carried off to Babylon, Isa 39:6 and 2 Kgs 20:17. Does Mt 2:10-11 hint at their return to his son, the Son of David?

2 The "virgin" or woman of marriageable age (עלמה) is identified as the (new) wife of King Ahaz, and the child as her firstborn, by A. Bentzen, M. Buber, J. Steinmann, E. Hammerschaimb, S. Mowinckel, and J. Lindblom, according to O. Kaiser, *Der Prophet Jesaja, Kapitel 1-12* (ATD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963) 80 n. 11; J. J. Scullion, "An Approach to the Understanding of Isaiah 7:10-17," *JBL* 87 (1968) 288-300, 295. Hezekiah is accepted as the promised child, with great reserve, by Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 290-293. At all events, what Isaiah meant is secondary to what Mt and his audience understood, and from Mt 1:20 it is clear the child is by right a Davidid. See also n. 2 on p. 67.

Jesus, his eternal priesthood and successful preaching of conversion, show that Psalm 110 refers to him, not Hezekiah (Chapters 33; 83).[1] Most interestingly, Justin has the sequence Isaiah 7:10-16a/8:4/7:16b-17. Every time he alludes to this text he mentions Hezekiah in order to refute Trypho's application of it to that monarch (Chapters 43; 66; 68; 71; 77-78). Justin (and shortly afterwards Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 3. 13) in this fashion identify the magi with the spoils of Samaria-Damascus (Arabia) of Isaiah 8:4, and relate both to the Davidic child of the virgin of Isaiah 7:14. Abstracting from the question whether Justin used the same text of Matthew as the one now current, his Isaian catena suggests that in his milieu Matthew 1:23 (Isaiah 7:14) was read in the light of 2:1-12 (Isaiah 8:4).[2]

It is possible that this Jewish exegesis was an answer to Christian claims that Jesus was the Davidic Christ of Isaiah and the Psalms. But, besides Justin, two pieces of evidence point to its dating from at least as early as 70 A.D. The first is the indication of the respect for Hezekiah among Zealot leaders of the first century.[3] The other is the command of

---

1 See P. Prigent, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1964) 145-149, also pp. 81-84, 321-322. Very possibly Justin is correct about Jews seeing Hezekiah in Ps 110; cf. K. Hruby, "Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse patristique," *RevScRel* 47 (1973) 341-369, 355.

2 Was this combination Jewish (and probably available to the evangelist), or Christian? The answer depends on Justin's familiarity with Jewish exegesis. The authenticity of the dialogue is doubted, but Justin's acquaintance with Jewish traditions documented, by A. H. Goldfahn, "Justinus Martyr und die Agada," *MGWJ* 22 [N.F. 5] (1873) 49-60, 104-115, 145-153, 194-202, 257-269, esp. pp. 51-53 and 146-148. Goldfahn thinks the dialogue is fictional since the combination by Justin of Isa 7:14 and 8:4 goes unchallenged (p. 148). It may be unquestioned simply because Trypho accepts it! Stendahl (*School*, 181-182) thinks Justin may have had only secondhand acquaintance with oral or written Greek targums "from school and discussion." But Justin had a "wide variety of knowledge of Jewish lore" according to W. A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965) 114, and see pp. 71-89 and 115.

3 See M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums, I; Leiden/Köln: Brill, 1961) 298 n. 3, with reference to 2 Kgs 18:5. If there existed a Hezekian messianism, it is significant that the founder of the dynasty of Zealot leaders was a certain Hezekiah, whose family may have considered themselves Davidids (see end of n. 2 on p. 90, with citation of Jeremias). Cf. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots*, 28-29 and 52-53; also, J. Neusner, *A Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai Ca. 1-80 C.E.* (2d ed.; Leiden, 1970) 228-229.

Yoḥanan ben Zakkai at his escape from the fall of Jerusalem, which is reported in *Soṭa* 9:16, "Remove the impurity and make ready a royal throne for Hezekiah, the king of Judah." Relying on the not unambiguous testimony of the rebel leaders, Yoḥanan, and Justin, it is plausible that a pre-Matthean exegesis had already joined Isaiah 7:14 (Matthew 1:23) and 8:4 (Matthew 2:1-12), applying both to Hezekiah understood as an eschatological figure. In turn this would link the annunciation to Joseph with the adoration by the magi, and enhance the coherence of Matthew 1-2.

This possibility is strengthened by the echoes of the Hezekiah episode of Isaiah 39:1-2 in 2:10-11. Is it fortuitous that three verses after the displaying by Hezekiah of his treasures to the eastern worthies comes the voice crying in the desert, Isaiah 40:3, which also occurs in Matthew three verses after the pre-baptism cycle, 3:3? Further, a Christian reader might detect an anticipation of his Messiah in the career of that king. The general similarities between Jesus and Hezekiah are obvious: both were grievously threatened by their enemies and miraculously delivered; both cleansed the Temple; both suffered unto death. Indeed, some rabbis were so impressed by the mortal illness of Hezekiah that they considered Micah 1:9-10 spoke of his suffering.[1] The combination of these three experiences is unique in a successor to David. But Christian sensibilities might be just as impressed by details which are intriguingly coincidental. Like Jesus, Hezekiah rose up (ἀνέστη, Isaiah 38:9 and 39:1), and after three days went up to the house of the Lord (2 Kings 20:5, 8; Isaiah 38:22-39:1). He was Emmanuel in the sense that "the Lord was with him" (2 Kings 18:7; and note the reminiscences of Isaiah 7:11-14 in 38:5-7). He enjoyed power (ἐξουσία in 39:2; compare Matthew 28:18). He would not serve the king of Assyria, and was delivered from that despot whom both Justin and Tertullian equate with Herod! He gave tribute to the Gentiles (2 Kings 18:14-16). Finally, his reception of the Babylonian envoys has almost its mirror image in Matthew 2:10-11. Therefore, it is quite possible that Jewish appreciation of Hezekiah may have helped the shapers of the traditions behind the Gospel of the Origins, or, more probably, Matthew himself, to articulate Christian faith in the Davidic child of the Spirit. Writing about 135 A.D., Justin was acquainted with (some form of) Matthew 1-2, and may be dubbed

---

1 Schniewind, *Matthäus*, 17.

its first expositor. The fact that both the evangelist and Justin base their compositions to a great extent on Isaiah and the royal psalms lends some credibility to the foregoing speculation. The attention paid to Hezekiah at least represents an effort to recapture early Christian thought processes in a Jewish milieu.[1]

(e) *Matthew 2:13-15 - The Exiled King.* - Nearly all commentators ascribe the quotation in 2:15 to Hosea 11:1.[2] But the scribe of the Codex Sinaiticus thought it came from Numbers. His instinct was correct. Matthew's use of Hosea is an echo of Numbers 23:22 and 24:8, which in their turn have been read in the light of the star of David in Numbers 24:17.[3] It would be an exaggeration to claim that the evangelist was thinking of David's flight from Saul into Egypt (Gaza area). But it is essential to his purpose that the prophetic exodus of Balaam and Hosea looks to the leadership of the Son of David. In this manner the tactical withdrawal to Egypt is in harmony with the first century Davidic star tradition in the preceding pericope of the magi.

---

1 Early Jewish exegesis squeezed every drop of "meaning" out of the sacred text. This fact permits further conjecture, indeed "wild surmise," about possible contacts between the Christ of Mt 1-2 and Hezekian expectations. For example, in 2 Kgs 18:2 the mother of Hezekiah is called Abi or Abou. But the Hebrew of 2 Chron 29:1 has "Abijah" ("My Father is Yahweh"). This theophoric name could easily be linked with a verse applied to Hezekiah by Trypho, Ps 110:3, "I have begotten you in the womb before the morning star." In this event the divine begetting and the star would correspond to the Mt 1 and 2 sequence, and accord with Justin's combination of Isa 7:14 and 8:4.

2 The context in Hos is apt: the king of Israel will soon die; a return to Egypt is threatened; a sword will cut down the inhabitants of Ephraim's towns. If such allusions were intended, do they add anything beyond the atmosphere of God writing straight by means of crooked lines?
Rev 11:8 calls Jerusalem "spiritually" Egypt, and 12:5-6 speaks of the escape of the woman and her child. Egypt is to be taken literally in Mt 2:13-14. But the evangelist uses such irony in 2:1-12 about "king," "homage," Bethlehem versus Jerusalem, that the bitter metaphorical understanding of Egypt as Jerusalem in 2:15 is not to be dismissed out of hand. However, to posit an evocation of the resurrection is certainly "a bit fanciful" (Brown, *Messiah*, 220 n. 22). If Egypt in 2:15 implies Jerusalem, it explains why the quotation is inserted at the departure from Judaea, and is in the past tense. On the wider fulfilment aspect of 2:15 see Moule, *Origin*, 127-129.

3 See p. 44; M'Neile, *Matthew*, 18; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 83; and specially Hill, *Matthew*, 85: "Num. 24.7-8 (LXX) could be understood to mean that God led Messiah (rather than Jacob) out of Egypt."

(f) *Matthew 2:16-18 - The King Attacked.* The slaughter of the Davidids or Bethlehemites by the "king" of Jerusalem recalls the double pogrom against the royal family by Jehoram of Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 21: 4) and his Israelite, Baal-worshipping wife Athaliah (2 Chronicles 22:10). This observation gains in cogency if seen as part of Matthew's fondness for the priestly historian. Most of his genealogy, right down to the fourteen generations, is dependent on the opening chapters of First Chronicles. These genealogies in chapters 1-9 lead up to the Davidic Kingdom of Yahweh in the body of the work, just as Matthew's family tree anticipates the impregnation of his Gospel by the Davidic tradition. The finale of the First Gospel resembles the conclusion of the Hebrew Bible, the end of Second Chronicles. The evangelist is the sole New Testament author to mention Asaph (1:7-8), an important figure in priestly and prophetic circles (see 2 Chronicles 20:14-20). He also quotes Asaph's Psalm 79, and alludes to his Psalm 80.

Granted Matthew's penchant for the Chronicler, his omission of the murderous Jehoram's three successors from the genealogy at 1:9 repays investigation in regard to the repetition of that ruler's atrocity at Bethlehem. Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah were all idolaters. Chronicles differs from Kings by two emphases which are also evident in Matthew 1-2. Firstly, great importance is given to prophetic commentary. Each of the three kings met with prophetic disfavour, and came to a violent end. Jehu, anointed by Elisha, slew Ahaziah who followed false counsel. Joash had his critic Zechariah stoned to death (Matthew 23:35; Luke 11:50), and was slain by his officers for this crime. Amaziah threatened his anonymous prophetic monitor, and was later assassinated because he turned away from the Lord. See 2 Chronicles 22:3-9; 24:17-25; 25:14-16, 27-28. Secondly, there is the insistence on the continuation of the line of David, despite its infidelities and notwithstanding the two massacres. Immediately after Jehoram's liquidation of his brother Davidids at his accession, "he walked in the ways of the kings of Israel . . . Yet the Lord would not destroy the house of David, because of the covenant he had made with David, and since he had promised to give a lamp[1] to him and to his sons for ever" (2 Chronicles

---

1 The lamp implies a planet or star and dominion: R. H. Smith, "The Household Lamps of Palestine in Old Testament Times," *BA* 27 (1964) 1-31; P. D. Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon and David's NÎR," *HTR* 61 (1968) 297-320.

21:6-7; significantly, the parallel in 2 Kings 8:19 reads "Judah" in place of "house of David," and does not mention the covenant with him). The writer's reverence for the dynasty of David emerges in his refusal to allow burial with their royal ancestors to Jehoram and his three unworthy descendants, 2 Chronicles 21:20; 22:9; 24:25; 25:28.[1] This is a total reversal of the account in 2 Kings 8:24; 9:28; 12:22; and 14:20. In short, the fidelity of Yahweh to his covenant with David is double-edged: remorseless prophetic opposition to the unfaithful kings and exclusion from the royal sepulchre, yet unfailing provision of an heir of David's blood. Matthew also saw God's hand in the rejection of Jerusalem and David's lowly Son.

A further observation may be of some importance for gauging Matthew's debt to the Chronicler. Immediately after the above passage about Jehoram come the words: "In his days Edom revolted from the rule of Judah, and set up a king of their own . . . So Edom revolted from the rule of Judah to this day" (21:8, 10). First century readers would surely observe that the wheel had come full circle. Now the Edomite Herod ruled in Judah and persecuted the Davidid. Later Amaziah worshipped the gods of the defeated Edomites in Jerusalem. For this the unnamed prophet warned that God would destroy him, 2 Chronicles 25:14-16. In the period of Matthew 2 it was again the standards of the Idumean that prevailed in Jerusalem, so that the whole city quailed at the prospect of the Messiah ben David, 2:3.

Can the omission from the genealogy of the three idolatrous, prophet-hating Davidids throw light on the slaughter of the Bethlehem infants by Herod? These three kings also did their best to obliterate the name of David. Elisha, Zechariah, and a third anonymous prophet unmasked their wickedness. To judge from his series of fulfilment formula quotations, Matthew always paid close attention to the prophets. Probably the most that can be claimed is, that the gap in the genealogy and 23:35 show that the evangelist had meditated on their careers. This meditation, in turn, would illuminate for him and his circle the Davidic background to the Idumean's massacre. The lethal internecine struggles of Judah's former rulers of the house of David, and their hostility to the Idumeans, strike the chord to the bass note of Herod's murders.

---

1 Following some psalms, the Davidic kings seem to have been considered close to Yahweh after death. Evidence of such special privilege may be found in the siting of their tombs within Jerusalem: Eaton, *Psalms*, 162f.

(g) *Matthew 2:19-23 - The King Thriving.* - The last fulfilment formula quotation is a *crux interpretum.* Nevertheless, if the slant of the evangelist in his opening chapters is taken into account, one solution commends itself above any other. Other explanations need not be rehearsed, since they have been amply catalogued and assessed.[1]

What is probably the oldest and most widespread opinion connects the Nazarene with the *neṣer* (נצר) of Isaiah 11:1, the Branch from the root of Jesse.[2] This noun occurs four times in the Old Testament, thrice in royal contexts: Isaiah 11:1; 14:19 (?); Daniel 11:7. The Septuagint translates the first and third occurrence by ἄνθος; and the collective, new Jerusalem, usage of Isaiah 60:21 by φύτευμα.[3] The reasons for preferring this interpretation of Ναζωραῖος are three: *neṣer* is part of the messianic hope of "the prophets"; these hopes were still alive at Qumran; and *neṣer* fits admirably into Matthew's theology.

A constellation of terms for the Messiah may be grouped around the Davidic Branch of Isaiah 11:1 (and note verse 10). It is associated with the *ṣemaḥ* (צמח), the Branch, of Isaiah 4:2; Jeremiah 23:5; 33:15; Zechariah 3:8 and 6:2. The Septuagint renders this by ἀνατολή, a word with overtones of rising, of growth, of day-star and light.[4] The Root (ῥίζα) of David

---

1 By, among others, E. Zuckschwerdt, "*Nazōraîos* in Matth. 2,23," *TZ* 31 (1975) 65-77; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 193-207; Brown, *Messiah*, 208-213, 223-225, with bibliography on p. 230.

2 E.g., O. Bardenhewer, *Maria Verkündigung. Ein Kommentar zu Lukas 1,26-38* (BibS[F] X,5; Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1905) 63-67; Gomá Civit, *Mateo*, 78-83; Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 163-164; O. Betz, "'Kann denn aus Nazareth etwas Gutes kommen?' (Zur Verwendung von Jesaia Kap. 11 in Johannes Kap. 1)," *Wort und Geschichte. Festschrift für Karl Elliger zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Gese and H. P. Rüger; AOAT 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1973) 9-16, 13-15. See further the studies in n. 1.

3 The Messiah is associated both with Nazareth and his community of Nazarenes through referring Mt 2:23 to Isa 60:21 according to C. Rabin, "Noṣerim," *Textus* 5 (1966) 44-52.

4 A network of (crypto-)Davidic messianic passages is knit by the link-words: ἀνατέλλω, ἀνίστημι, Branch, Root, sceptre, star. E.g., Gen 49:9-10; Num 24:9, 17; 2 Sam 7:12; Pss 2:7-9; 132:17; Isa 11:1, 10; Jer 30:9, 14-15; 33:5; Mt 2:2; Lk 1:78; Rom 1:3-4; 15:12; Rev 2:26-28; 5:5; 22:16. On their interrelation consult Daniélou, "1'Étoile de Jacob"; D. C. Duling, "The Promises to David and their Entrance into Christianity - Nailing down a Likely Hypothesis," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 55-77; and also, H. H. Schlier, "ἀνατολή," *TDNT* 1 (1964 [1933]) 352-353; Petitjean, "La Mission de Zorobabel," 63-71; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978) 94-95.

completes the triad.[1] These interrelated terms of Davidic messianology provide the basis for Matthew's understanding of Nazareth and Ναζωραῖος.

Qumran has many attestations of the expectation of "the Messiah of righteousness, the Branch (*ṣemaḥ*) of David": *4QpIsaiah* 1; *4QPatriarchal Blessings* 3-4; *4QFlorilegium* 10. The *Hôdāyôt* use *neṣer* apparently in the sense of Isaiah 60:21, applying it to the community or "Plant(ation)" of the last times: 6:15; 7:19; 8:4-20 (especially verses 6, 8, 10, 20). The eighth hymn has a passage which may throw light on Matthew 2:23: "The bud of the shoot (*neṣer*) of holiness for the Plant of truth was hidden and was not esteemed; and being unperceived, its mystery was sealed" (verses 10-11).[2] Here the eschatological *neṣer* is obscure and lowly.[3]

The use of the (*neṣer*-)ἀνατολή-ῥίζα image spans the New Testament - Matthew 2:2, 23; Luke 1:78; Romans 15:12; 2 Peter 1:19; Revelation 9:15 and 22:16. The polarity of the insignificant shoot which burgeons, and the dawning light which waxes, has obvious affinities with Davidic messianism. First Samuel 16, Second Samuel 7:8 with the poetry of chapters 22-23, and first century Judaism as evidenced by Psalm 151 and Pseudo-Philo, dwelt on the modest beginnings of the monarch's career. Matthew also begins with a stock of David reduced to poor estate, 1:1-25. Then he broaches the *ṣemaḥ*-ἀνατολή theme with the star of the magi. The harassment of the Davidids

---

1 C. Maurer, "ῥίζα," *TDNT* 6 (1968 [1959]) 985-990.

2 Translation from Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 176. Unlike the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document, the Hymns have no technical terms for the community. Instead they use botanical metaphors: M. Delcor, *Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)* ("Autour de la Bible"; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962) 53 [contributed by W. Eiss], 201; S. Fujita, "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 30-45. Although *ṣemaḥ* and *neṣer* can both mean branch or shoot, the OT and Qumran regard the first as a messianic individual term, and *neṣer* as a collective and non-messianic term, except when Isa 11:1 is in question; cf. L. Moraldi, "Qumraniana: *Neṣer* e *Ṣemaḥ*," *RSO* 45 (1970) 209-216. Significantly, the blessing of the Prince of the Congregation, 1QSb 20-29, applies to him the ideal of Isa 11:2, 4 and Num 24:17.

3 Compare the despised *neṣer* of Isa 14:19, the dead king of Babylon. In the LXX the (Davidic) Root (שרש, ῥίζα) of Isa 11:1, 10 and 53:2 is accompanied by a disfigured and spurned child, παιδίον, in 53:2, where the Hebrew has "sapling," ינק. See n. 4 on p. 205. On 1QH 8:4-20 consult M. Wallenstein, *The* Neẓer *and the Submission in Suffering Hymn from the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, II; Istanbul: NHAI in het Nabije Oosten, 1957) 19 n. 30; 24 n. 102. Note the general statement of Hill, *Matthew*, 88.

follows, and the flight to the obscurity of Nazareth. But soon from Galilee of the Gentiles will stream the light, 4:15-16. A complex of royal texts is here exploited. Besides the cited Isaiah 9:1-2, there is 11:10 (LXX: "the root of Jesse . . . in him shall the Gentiles hope"), and perhaps even the servant of 53:2, as well as Genesis 49:10 and Numbers 24:17.[1] Matthew had to show how the Messiah could come from the unknown backwater Nazareth, graced by no appearance in the scriptures. By means of the *neṣer* complex he could incorporate this humble beginning[2] into the Davidic mystique, find room for "his people" the Nazarenes (compare Isaiah 60:21 and Qumran Hymns), and even hint at the paradox of the universal outreach of the villager from Nazareth.[3] The Old Testament and Qumran background of *neṣer*, and the Isaian and Matthean theology of humiliation and suffering as the prelude to glory, combine to recommend this rich meaning for 2:23. The verse penetrates a secret of divine providence. Why were the Son of David - and his harried disciples - called "Nazarenes"? The prophets, as then understood, aided the evangelist to discover the plan of God. This contemned *Neṣer*-ene was in truth the anticipated prophet king who, despite

---

1 Further in n. 4 on p. 212. The Balaam oracle of Num 24:17 is connected with Isa 11:1 in Jewish Christian iconography, which superimposes star and branch - as they are linked in Mt 2; see B. Bagatti, *L'Eglise de la Circoncision* (Publications du Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collection minor n. 2; Jérusalem: Imprimerie des PP. Franciscains, 1965) 135-137.

2 See p. 213 for pre-Matthean attitude. The contempt for Jesus' Nazareth origin evinced by Jn 1:45-46, and perhaps by what may have been a nickname - "Nazarenes," has been glimpsed in Mt 2:23 by Lagrange, *Matthieu*, 39; Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 196; Hengel and Merkel, "Die Magier," 165-166, who see a foreshadowing of the way of the cross. O. Betz ("'Kann denn aus Nazareth,'" 15) considers that Mk 6:2-3 contrasts Nazareth with Jesus' miracles and wisdom. Is it mere coincidence that Lk 2:51 reads, "He went down . . . to Nazareth, and was *obedient* to them"?
On the hiddenness of the Davidic prophet-Messiah see Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen," 13-15; and n. 35 on p. 8, where he hazards the hypothesis that Ναζωραῖος meant a wonder-worker.

3 The *semaḥ*-ἀνατολή and ῥίζα passages in the LXX and NT often imply royal dominion. This is clear in the fundamental text, Isa 11:1, 10, and in the ingathering of the Gentiles in the stellar tradition (p. 74 n. 1). The imparting of the Spirit to the Son of David in Mt 3:16 is anticipated in Isa 11:2, the continuation of Isa 11:1. The servant(-King?) of Mt's fulfilment formula quotation in 12:18-21 identifies the Spirit-endowed ἀγαπητός as unassuming yet influencing the world, - no one will hear "his voice in the streets . . . in his name will the Gentiles hope" (Isa 42:1-4LXX). This is the very contrast with which Mt rounded off his Gospel of the Origins in 2:23 - lowly beginning but imperial future.

insignificant beginnings and rejection, would save his people and enlighten the Gentiles.[1]

Summary. - Previous summaries obviate the need of recapitulating the whole of Chapter 7, A.[2] Matthew 1 is patently the preparation for the prophetic servant-Messiah, and the presentation of the saintly Davidic child of the Spirit born to the royal virgin, and destined to deploy his regal power to save from sin. The second chapter is dominated by the clash of the false king of Jerusalem with the shepherd-king of David's Bethlehem. The internecine feuds of the Davidids, and possibly Isaiah's account of Hezekiah, are also echoed here. Both the summoning of the Son from Egypt and the mourning of Rachel for the lethal division of her children can credibly, although not certainly, be connected with the liberating and unifying role of the Son of David regarding his people. The homage of the Gentile magi foreshadows the universal realm of the Messiah of David, and his star and branch show the execution of the saving plan of the Lord in 2:1-12 and 23. The entire Gospel of the Origins witnesses to the fact that this triumph of God's promise to David begins in obscurity, and passes through the pain of opposition and division in Israel.

---

1 Many refuse to choose between the many interpretations of "Nazarene," e.g. Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 32-33; Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 43-44; McConnell, *Law and Prophecy*, 114-117; Hill, *Matthew*, 87-88; Hartman, "Scriptural Exegesis," 149-150; or combine them, like Brown, *Messiah*, 223-225. In view of the coherent explanation furnished by *neṣer*, such indecision is unwarranted.

Recent studies tend to favour a reference to *nāzîr*, and in particular to Judg 13:5, 7 and 16:17; e.g., E. Schweizer, J. A. Sanders, P. Bonnard, M. Goulder, E. Zuckschwerdt, G. M. Soares Prabhu, and L. Sabourin. Without conceding the necessity, or even the validity, of this opinion, it may be mentioned that two further points can be adduced in its favour. First, 1QH 8:10 speaks of a "holy Branch," נצר קדוש. Second, the king wore an emblem of his consecration, a נזר, which could evoke *nāzîr* and Nazareth. See 2 Kgs 11:12; 2 Chron 23:11; Pss 89:40; 132:18; and Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 287-289.

2 Mt's "Christ" is a redemptive, prophetic, but not a political, figure (p. 149). Jesus is, according to the criteria of his time, a descendant of David, and as such a threat to the pretensions of Herod (pp. 157-158). In first century Judaism, David, Solomon, and the Son of David (consequently), were admired as chosen and raised up by Yahweh, as sages who spoke on behalf of God, as mediators of grace to Israel, as endowed with the Spirit to heal, and teach, and conquer, and as Lords of the Gentiles (p. 169). This image explains the prophetic teacher, healer, and Shepherd-King of the Twelve tribes, who in the power of the Spirit refashions essential Israel in Mt 3-28 (pp. 200-201).

B. THE CHRIST THE SON OF THE LORD GOD

The religious anthropology of sonship in Scripture must first be plumbed before the divine filiation of the Davidic Christ of the Gospel of the Origins may be understood in the stronger light of the traditions and insight of the whole First Gospel.

1) *The Meaning of Being a Son*

The following paragraphs indicate how the content of the idea of divine sonship is taken from the sphere of familial and, by extension, political relationships. Even divine sonship is clarified by answering the question: What does it mean to be a son for the audience of Matthew?

The complex of ideas involved may conveniently be associated with three areas: the training of the child, his subordination to his father, and his role of successor to the latter's functions and position. These three activities may be labelled: Learning, Loyalty, Legitimation.

a. The Son as Learner

The father teaches his son not only a trade or occupation, but educates him to a whole life-style.[1] For this reason the wisdom teacher often addresses his pupils as "son," and is himself called "father."[2] This manner of expressing the communication of knowledge and skill persists into the New Testament period, and is found in apocrypha.[3] It also appears in Matthew 11:25-27 (parallel Luke 10:21-22): "All things have been delivered

---

1 De Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 49-50; "υἱός," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 343 and 345 (G. Fohrer); 357 (E. Lohse); 365 (E. Schweizer).

2 See J. W. McKay, "Man's Love for God in Deuteronomy and the Father/Teacher - Son/Pupil Relationship," *VT* 22 (1972) 426-435, esp. pp. 432-435; Schlisske, *Gottessöhne*, 172-183.

3 The ramifications of this teacher-learner model are very wide in the view of K. Berger, "Hintergrund," 422-424. For instance, conversion implies knowledge of God. But the imparting of knowledge is associated with the gift of the Spirit. Therefore, Paul explains the sonship (the being-taught-by-God) of believers as the reception of the Spirit in Gal 3:26; 4:7; Rom 8:15. Such divinely instructed persons are called "beloved," ἀγαπητός, e.g., Jn 3:35; 5:20; *T. Benj.* 11:2; *T. Levi* 17:2-3, etc. The notion of a son being taught by his father, called beloved, and endowed with the Spirit, has evident importance for the baptism of Jesus, although Berger does not discuss this here. Note how in *T. Sal.* D 1,2 David is called the beloved and chosen one of God (p. 7, n. 31). See further Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen," 28-30.

to me by my Father; . . . and no one knows the Father except the Son."[1] The same thought appears in the concealed parable in John 5:19-30 of the son as apprentice to the father, who is the Master Craftsman of judging and lifegiving.[2] A less obvious Matthean connection between the Son and paternal instruction is the scene of the transfiguration, 17:1-13. Both Moses and Elijah experienced the Presence. The study of the Torah was held to be Israel's encounter with Yahweh. Therefore it is fitting these should be his interlocutors when he is portrayed as the outstanding pupil, the "beloved Son" who is intimate with his *Doktorvater*. Since he has been such a diligent learner, he can now be presented as the supreme teacher - "Listen to him!"[3]

But there is a less gentle side to the education of sons. There is the testing and discipline known as *mûsār* (מוסר, παιδεία) in Deuteronomy 8:5; Proverbs 3:11-12; 13:24; 19:18; 29:17; Isaiah 50:4-5; 53:5. First century Judaism pondered on this. The eighteenth Psalm of Solomon appreciates divine discipline: "Thy love is toward the seed of Abraham . . . thy chastisement is upon us as upon a firstborn, only-begotten son, to turn back the obedient soul from folly." Sonship is a process of training as well as a status.[4] In this context the testing of Jesus as Son of God wins deeper meaning. The instructed (Spirit-endowed and beloved) Son of the baptism shows that he knows his lessons and has absorbed the mind of his Father.

---

1 On instruction background see Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, Law*, 89-95; Smith, *Wisdom Christology*, 15-43; L. Randellini, "L'inno di giubilo: Mt. 11,25-30; Lc. 10,20-24," *RivB* 22 (1974) 183-235, 206-207, 214-216, 226.

2 See C. H. Dodd, J. Jeremias, in Randellini, "L'inno di giubilo," 190-191.

3 Justification for these statements is found in Davies, *Setting*, as expanded by J. Massingberd Ford in her review in *Bib* 48 (1967) 623-628, at pp. 624-625. The practice of Merkabah contemplation by Yoḥanan ben Zakkai (about 70 A.D.) illustrates how meditation on Scripture (that is, behaving as a learner-son before Abba-God) could usher a scholar into the throneroom of God; see J. W. Bowker, "'Merkabah' Visions and the Visions of Paul," *JSS* 16 (1971) 157-173, esp. the general principles on pp. 157-158; also Hengel, *Son of God*, 89-90. On Yahweh teaching his "son" to walk (הלך) in the way of the commandments, see G. A. F. Knight, *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 1964) 159-160.

4 *Pss. Sol.* 18:4-5; cf. 13:9; 4QBt col. III, lines 5-7: "Thou hast named Israel, 'My son, my firstborn,' and hast chastised us as a man chastises his son" (translation Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 203); 4 Ezra (2 Esdr) 6: 57-58, where the suffering firstborn is called the *aemulatorem carissimum*, presumably meaning the dutiful son copies his father.

Jesus' familiarity with Deuteronomy enables him to unmask the wiles of Satan, and to demonstrate his sonship - his enlightened, effective love of his Father with all his heart, soul, and strength (Matthew 4:1-11, and page 172 above). Later there is the taunt on Calvary, "If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross" (27:40-43). For the evangelist, authentic sonship lies in the realization by Jesus that the Father wills his death. He is the wise Son, who knows what the Father desires, and cooperates with him. But the representatives of establishment Jewry lack this filial insight into the mind and heart of God.

b. The Son as Loyal

The loyalty in question is that fidelity which reproduces in one party the purposes, and even the character, of the other party. The Son is, naturally, servant (παῖς/υἱός) to the Father.[1] The notion of obedient sonship has a long history in the ancient Near East. Obviously it reflects the universal domestic situation of the paterfamilias expecting his sons to be submissive. But the familial reality was projected into political life. Treaties between suzerain and vassal demanded the "love" of the "son" for his "father" overlord.[2] This type of love can be commanded because it is not dependent on feelings or temperament. It corresponds to the Roman *pietas*, the loyal devotion of a son to his father, the abiding sense of filial duty which transcends quirks of personality or emotional vagaries.

The close association of sonship and obedience in the Bible has not, of course, escaped the attention of scholars.[3] It is apparent in the Gospels.

---

1 The equivalence between παῖς, υἱός, and δοῦλος appears in Wis 2:13, 16, 18; 9:4-5, 7; 12:19-21. Compare the youth/servant ambivalence of "boy," "garçon." Cf. J. Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ," *TDNT* 5 (1967) 678-679.

2 See McCarthy, *OT Covenant*, 33, 66, 84-85; J. de Vaulx, "Maison de David, Maison de Dieu," *AsSeign* 8 (1972) 28-33.

3 Str-B 1. 219-220; Foerster, "κληρονόμος," *TDNT* 3 (1965) 782; De Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 119-125; Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 91-92; Gerhardsson, "Gottes Sohn als Diener Gottes"; Fohrer, "υἱός," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 343, 352; Longenecker, *Christology*, 98-99; C. F. D. Moule, "The manhood of Jesus in the New Testament," *Christ, Faith and History. Cambridge Studies in Christology* (ed. S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton; Cambridge: University Press, 1972) 95-110, 101; *Origins*, 29-31; R. Bauckham, "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology," *SJT* 31 (1978) 245-260, 257: "Sonship is a relationship to be fulfilled in mission, and as such it both determines and is validated by Jesus' whole life and fate"; and p. 260 on the inseparability of human and divine sonship.

John has absorbed this moral dimension of divine sonship. For him such filiation is "a representation and self-communication on the part of God, obedience and submission of will on the part of the 'son,' which is designed to lead to the self-revelation of God."[1] Luke also stresses the dependence of the Son from, and his communion with, the Father.[2] But it is Matthew who, in his rather stark manner, points up the sonlike obedience of Jesus. His simplest technique is his use of "the will of the Father" instead of the normal "will of God": 7:21; 12:50; 18:12; and compare 6:10; 21:31; 26:42.[3] The first evangelist also presents Jesus as the one who perfected and fulfilled the will of his Father. This is obvious in the fulfilment formula quotations, and in his whole teaching about righteousness. Baptism of the Son to fulfil all righteousness, the testing of the Son who knew the word of God, submission to the Father in the Pater and Gethsemane, the obedience of the derided Son on the cross - all are instances of Jesus being the model of docile sonship.[4] Finally, the filial

---

1 J. Howton, "'Son of God' in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 10 (1963/64) 227-237, 236. Compare H. Schneider, "'The Word Was Made Flesh.' An Analysis of the Theology of Revelation in the Fourth Gospel," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 344-356, 353: "Who God is, namely a loving Father, and who Jesus is, [namely a loyal Son,] can only be revealed by a total self-giving, which is, on the one hand, perfect obedience to the Father's will and, on the other, a self-sacrificing love for man."

2 "Cette filiation n'est pas un titre solennel, ni un privilège, mais une dépendance, une intimité, une communion totale: être le Fils, pour Jésus, ce n'est rien autre que vivre par son Père et pour lui, accomplir son dessein et assurer sa gloire": A. George, "Jésus Fils de Dieu dans l'Évangile selon Saint Luc," *RB* 72 (1965) 185-209, 209. Jesus' filial *Machtverzicht* is illustrated by J. Blank, "Die Sendung des Sohnes. Zur christologischen Bedeutung des Gleichnisses von den bösen Winzern Mk 12, 1-12," *Neues Testament und Kirche. Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (ed. J. Gnilka; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974) 11-41, 27-32.

3 On "the will of (my) Father" in Mt see Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 187-188; R. E. Brown, *Jesus God and Man. Modern Biblical Reflections* (London/Dublin: Chapman, 1968) 88-89. On Mt's preference for "Father" see Thompson, *Matthew's Advice*, 155.

4 Further on pages 122-123 above; and G. Barth, *Tradition and Interpretation*, 137-153; Strecker, *Weg*, 177-184, "Das Vorbild Jesu"; J. M. Gibbs, "The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew," *SE* IV (1968) 38-46, 42-46, who denies there is a New Law in Mt, but "rather the Good News that in Jesus the Torah, the demand of God's righteousness, is now totally and efficaciously present and that in him there is rest" (p. 46); Meier, *Law and History*, 87-89 (who, however, believes that Jesus the Messiah did abrogate some commandments of the Law).

obedience of Jesus is divinely sealed by the ἐξουσία granted to him after his utter fidelity. The Risen One can point to his teaching, and implicitly to his practice, when he sends forth his graduate students to make disciples of all nations, 28:18-20. The loyalty of the Son to the Father shapes the meaning of *cui servire regnare est.*[1]

c. The Son as Legitimated

There is a distinction between adoption and legitimation. The former is by its nature uncommon, but legitimation is extended to every son worthy of the name. There are no directives concerning adoption in the Old Testament. It may have been practised, but the emphasis falls on the legitimation of children by paternal acceptance. This applies particularly to the Davidic king, who is acknowledged as son by Yahweh at his enthronement.[2]

It is essential to appreciate the burden of responsibility entailed for the son in his divine legitimation. His sonship is linked to inheritance of Zion, and the duty of caring for the place of Yahweh's rest. This honour includes sharing Yahweh's universal lordship.[3]

The royal element in the New Testament presentation of the divine sonship of Jesus has frequently been discussed.[4] Such an understanding of the

---

1 Like the centurion, Jesus can order out illness only because he too is under command, the leading subject of the Kingdom he inaugurates. "It is highly significant that Jesus speaks of his *exousia* (literally 'right to power' as distinct from *dunamis*, 'expression of power') only after the Resurrection, when God's new creation has finally taken place for him personally (Matt. 28:16)": S. Freyne, "The Exercise of Christian Authority according to the New Testament," *ITQ* 37 (1970) 93-117, 96.

2 Cf. Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 259-267, with works in nn. 20 and 29.

3 Gese, "Natus ex virgine," 80(-87); Schlisske, *Gottessöhne*, 78-115; Dumortier, "Ps. LXXXIX," 187-189; Hengel, *Son of God*, 23.

4 For example, in the standard Christologies of O. Cullmann, F. Hahn, R. H. Fuller. E. Schweizer ("υἱός," *TDNT* 8 [1972] 369), in the course of a section on the Davidic Son of God (pp. 366-370), comments on the transfiguration, "there again it would seem that the institution of Jesus as King of the end-time is the root of His designation as Son of God." Particularly important is the fact that the resurrection was very early interpreted as the enthronement of the Messiah, the Son of David who was equally the Son of God. On this see Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 92-112; O. Betz, "The Kerygma of Luke," *Int* 22 (1968) 131-146, 139-140; J. H. Hayes, "The Resurrection as Enthronement and the Earliest Church Christology," *Int* 22, pp. 333-345; G. Ruggieri as in n. 4 on p. 151; Duling, "Promises," 70-77; Hengel, *Son of God*, (61-)64; Brown, *Messiah*, 136-137, 312-313.

risen Jesus seems to serve as a background to the closing verses of Matthew where the king has assumed full power. The baptism and transfiguration epiphanies are not tributary to any single strand of thought, Davidico-royal or other. But each is influenced by the expectation of the eschatological king and Son of God.

In short, truly to deserve the name, a son must be legitimated by his father. He must be designated as his heir and representative. In time this Son will wield the authority of his Father. After his learning and loyalty have conformed him to his Father, he will execute the latter's designs, and show him forth to mankind. This pattern of sonship may not be far from the mind of Paul: "All who are led by the Spirit of God [*Learner*] are sons of God. For you did not receive the spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received the spirit of sonship [*Loyal*]. When we cry 'Abba! Father!' it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ [*Legitimated*]" (Romans 8:14-17).

2) *The Son of the Lord God*

a. Legitimation by the Lord God

The preceding pages have sketched the Synoptic and Matthean understanding of Jesus as the learned and loyal Son.[1] But these aspects are automatically excluded from the Gospel of the Origins, where Jesus is only an infant. It is the legitimating Davidic father Joseph, not the child, who learns the will of God from the angel and loyally carries it out. In so doing he is the true disciple who contributes to the realization of the plan of the Lord by accepting Mary, and making the divinely conceived Emmanuel a member of the family of David, by retiring into Egypt, and by settling in Nazareth. Matthew's pre-baptism cycle witnesses not only to the legitimation of the Saviour as the Son of David (1:18-25; 2:6; 2:23), but also to his legitimation by the *Kyrios* as his Son (1:22-23; 2:15). The narrative of the origins has a necessarily restricted use of the divine

---

1 Despite the objections of F. Hahn (*Titles of Jesus*, 307-317), "Son" and "Son of God" may be equated in the royal tradition, where they are virtually indistinguishable in such passages as 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 89:26-27. See also I. H. Marshall, "The Divine Sonship of Jesus," *Int* 21 (1967) 87-103, 87-88; Coppens, *Messianisme royal*, 183-185; Longenecker, *Christology*, 96; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 42.

sonship of Jesus. The aspect of legitimation alone is applicable to the infant.

The legitimation of his Son by the *Kyrios* is discreetly but clearly expressed both by the use of the theological passive in 1:16 and 20, and by the addition to the fulfilment formula in 1:22 and 2:15. Τὸ γεννηθὲν in 1:20 echoes the ἐγεννήθη of verse 16, which deliberately clashes with the thirty-nine instances of the active human begetting in 1:2-16a (ἐγέννησεν). It is an almost inescapable conclusion that Matthew is here employing the reverential passive of divine activity.[1] It is the Lord God who through the Holy Spirit brings the child into existence. The *genesis* of 1:1 and 18 does not recur in Matthew, thereby dissuading a detailed exegesis.[2] Bearing in mind the probable interplay with the Matthean consummation, the συντελεία of 28:20 (and 13:39-40, 49; 24:3), and the evocation of the opening words of the Bible, *genesis* connotes the "beginning" of the end, and the "origin" of Jesus the Christ and his authority as Emmanuel.

Secondly, the only two fulfilment formula quotations which designate Jesus as "son" are also the sole ones to be introduced as uttered "by the Lord," namely, 1:22-23 ("a virgin shall conceive and bear a son . . . Emmanuel") and 2:15, "Out of Egypt have I called my son." Here the supremely authoritative word *of the Lord* God, spoken through Isaiah and Hosea, acknowledges the child conceived or newborn as his very Son.[3] Only God can

---

1 Cf. Pesch, "Gottessohn," 416-419; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 17; I. Broer, "Die Bedeutung der 'Jungfrauengeburt' im Matthäusevangelium," *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 248-260, 256-257; A. Vicent Cernuda, "La dialéctica γεννῶ-τίκτω en Mt 1-2," *Bib* 55 (1974) 408-417, 412-416; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 43-44. This interpretation is buttressed by Mt's careful use of the passive voice; cf. Allen, *Matthew*, xxiii; Lagrange, *Matthieu*, XCIII-XCIV. Note γεννηθέντος (2:1); ἀνήχθη (4:1); παρεδόθη (11:27); ἐδόθη (28:18). See also Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 40, 45, 49, 119 n. 8; Malina, "Literary Structure," 89, with reference to J. Jeremias; Miguens, *Virgin Birth*, 93.

2 See above pp. 24-25. Γένεσις in 1:18 can hardly introduce 1:18b-4:16, as proposed by W. B. Tatum, "'The Origin of Jesus Messiah' (Matt 1:1, 18a): Matthew's Use of the Infancy Traditions," *JBL* 96 (1977) 523-535, 525-526.

3 Geist, "Jesusverkündigung im Matthäusevangelium," 122-123; Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 52-53, citing R. Pesch. Cf. Nellessen, *Das Kind*, 93; Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure*, 50-51 - who suggest "Son of God" is absent from Mt 1:1 because the Father must first identify his Son. This embryonic Trinitarian theology occurs also in Heb 1:4-14; cf. M. Barth, "The OT in Hebrews," 61-64; T. F. Glasson, "'Plurality of Divine Persons' and the Quotations in Hebrews i.6ff," *NTS* 12 (1965/66) 270-272.

recognize himself. The Synoptics, and in particular Matthew, continue this line of thought that the Father alone can legitimate his Son. At the baptism it is peculiar to the First Gospel that the Father identifies his Son by using the indicative, "This is my beloved Son." With this may be compared the logion shared with Luke, "No one knows the Son except the Father" (11:27). Again, only Matthew stresses the necessity of a paternal revelation for Peter's acknowledgment of Jesus as the Son of the living God, 16:17. From this perspective it may be asked if the account in Matthew 22:41-46 and parallels of Jesus' question concerning the Christ was meant to elicit the reply of believers that the Messiah is *the* Son of David precisely *because he is the Son of the Lord God*? The Davidid who is the Christ is the one accepted as Son by the Lord.[1] Finally, the pantocrator of 28:17-20, vindicated as the unique Son of God (note 27:40, 43), can at last speak openly of the richness of divine self-communication to disciples - "Make disciples of all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."[2]

This solid evidence for the divine legitimation of Jesus as Son of God, and therefore the Christ, sheds light on an anomaly of the genealogy. Matthew supplies one generation less than the forty-two he computes in 1:17. Theological, numerological, and textual explanations of the "missing" generation in 1:12-16 are unconvincing, due to their failure to explore the evangelist's editing.[3] The "miscalculation" is deliberate, and points reverently to the mysterious conception from the Spirit. The anonymous progenitor is the Lord God, whose activity only he can proclaim (1:22 and 2:15). Five times human wisdom is baffled, humbled, in a chosen woman.

---

1 This interpretation would explain, with singular coherence, the twin concerns for Davidic and divine sonship in Mt 1-2. Note the remark of Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 15): "Als Davidide und Sohn Abrahams ist Jesus der Sohn Gottes!"; and, "The revelation of Jesus as God's Son led Paul to believe in his messianic status" (M. E. Thrall, "The Origin of Pauline Christology," *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday* [ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin; Exeter: Paternoster, 1970] 304-316, 309).

2 Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 323) observes justly that the interaction of the Father, Son, and Spirit in 1:16-23 and the baptism becomes quite explicit in the inclusion, 28:19. See also n. 4 on p. 107 above.

3 For such theories see Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 182-184, 222-223; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 96-97; Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key," 209-215; Brown, *Messiah*, 81-84.

The ultimate "irregularity" of the begetting of the Son of God, *the* Son of David, takes place in the numinous silence of the forty-second generation - ἐγεννήθη.

What does this acknowledgement by the Lord reveal about the type of divine sonship bestowed on Christ at his very origin? It is noteworthy that in the Gospel of the Origins the deity is called *Kyrios*, the Septuagint term for Yahweh. Elsewhere in Matthew, and in the New Testament in general, *Kyrios* denotes Jesus Christ.[1] The evangelist employs the sacral language of Israel which alone can express the beginnings of the Christ. Obvious reminiscences are: Κύριος εἶπεν πρός με Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε (Psalm 2:7), and Psalm 110:1 and 3, "The Κύριος said to my lord . . . from the womb before the dayspring I begot (ἐξεγέννησα) you." This enthronement legitimation is particularly relevant, since in the Old Testament only the Davidic king is divinely declared son to God, at his accession. This act entails a guarantee of assistance from Yahweh, a task, and the power to carry it out. The crowned Davidid is heir to the concerns of the Father whom he "embodies." He is the guardian of the divine presence on Zion, and is buoyed up with godly power - "Thy throne, O God, endures for ever!" (Psalm 45:6).

b. The Covenant with David as the Key to the Divine Sonship

The Davidic aura of Matthew 1-2 is patent. The reasons for the choice of the Davidic rather than the Mosaic covenant are deeply rooted in the old economy. These two patterns of relations between God and Israel are a pair of distinct, if interwoven, strands in the experience of Yahwists.[2] A

---

1 Cf. Knox, *Sources II*, 125-126; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 41 n. 48; D. Greenwood, "The Lord is the Spirit: Some Considerations of 2 Cor 3:17," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 467-472, 469-470; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Κύριος again," *Orientierung* (ed. P. Hoffmann) 214-219, 217-219; and n. 2 on p. 120.

2 On the twinning of the covenants with Abraham and David, and their difference from that of Sinai, see Clements and McCarthy in n. 2 on p. 35, also n. 2 on p. 170, and J. Bright, *Covenant and Promise* (London: SCM, 1977) 37-77. Indeed, Moses was portrayed in royal colours, especially by the Yahwist; cf. J. R. Porter, *Moses and Monarchy. A Study in the Biblical Traditions of Moses* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963); J. Plastaras, *The God of Exodus. The Theology of the Exodus Narratives* (Impact Books; Milwaukee: Bruce, 1966) 248-252, with reference to M. L. Newman; Meeks, *The Prophet-King*. The figure of Moses is absorbed into that of David in the Chronicler - see Poulssen, *König und Tempel*, 168-182.

comparison between them turns out to be a contrast. There is a tension between the frankly unilateral promise to David, and the almost bilateral covenant with all the people through Moses. To exaggerate this alternative: personal grace on the one hand, mutual and collective obligation on the other. In the case of David, the grace tends to edge out the demands of the Torah, for instance in Psalm 89:28-37, Isaiah 55:3, and Acts 13:34. The regal representative of the community becomes its mediator with Yahweh. Again, the Moses and Joshua traditions dwell on the lengthy process of installation throughout the Promised Land. The whole people are blessed in their own land, even their own holdings. But the royal theology focuses on the presence of Yahweh on Zion, to which the king alone is heir. Yet, if on the one hand the divine election narrows from the sons of Israel and their land to the son of David and his city, on the other hand it widens out to embrace the whole earth. The "firstborn" Davidic monarch is granted the nations as his birthright, e.g., Psalms 2:7-9; 18:47; Acts 2:36; 13:33; Hebrews 1:2 and 5. Finally, the Mosaic corpus traces the hand of God in the vicissitudes of the people's history. But a cosmic and atemporal strain permeates at least the more poetic and *Hofstil* passages exalting the Israelite monarchy: Psalms 2, 72, 89, and the collection 93-101. In order to achieve some clarity three overlapping areas may be reconnoitred: the king as son of God, Zion and its Temple as the navel of the earth, and primordial wisdom. Each of these has a mythical background, but already in the Old Testament they had become mystical realities. As such they were part of the indispensable heritage of the New Testament authors. Throughout the Bible, *king*, *temple*, and *wisdom* are all associated with *creation*, *redemption*, and even with the *spirit*. The latter triad is found in Matthew 1:18-25 as γένεσις (18), σώζειν (21b), and πνεῦμα ἅγιον (18b and 20c). By examining Old Testament and intertestamental royal mysticism, progress will be made towards laying bare the roots of Matthew 1-2.

The royal theology of the Old Testament is certainly tributary to early oriental ideas of the king as mediator of the cosmic order, as guarantor of Maat or *ṣedeq*.[1] By his righteousness (*ṣ^{e}daqah*) he triumphs over enemies

---

1 Further in W. M. Clark, "The righteousness of Noah," *VT* 21 (1971) 261-280, esp. p. 278 n. 1; C. F. Whitley, "Deutero-Isaiah's interpretation of *sedeq*," *VT* 22 (1972) 469-475; and the review of H. H. Schmidt, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung* (1968) by R. A. Rosenberg, *Bib* 50 (1969) 565-568.

and ensures the shalom of his people. He is the image or son of God.[1] See 2 Samuel 7; 23:2-4; Psalms 2, 45, 72, 89, 110; Isaiah 9:5-7; 11:1-9.[2] There is also the poignant Lamentations 4:20, "The breath (רוח) of our nostrils, the Lord's anointed, was taken in their pits, he of whom we said, 'Under his shadow we shall live among the nations'." The connection between royalty and salvation from hostile onslaughts is obvious. Saul was made king to fight the people's battles according to 1 Samuel 8:20. But the linking of the Davidic ruler with creation is less evident. The explanation for this lies in the theological grounding of the royal authority. The sequence of Yahweh's mastery over chaos in Psalm 89:5-18, and his communication of power to his firstborn heir, the son of David, in verses 19-37, is programmatic. The kingship is an extension of Yahweh's sway, and thus belongs to the "order" of nature as a cosmic, creative (better, structuring), force.[3]

Matthew's attribution of the birth of the Son of David to the creative Spirit is in keeping with this background. Indeed, a whole complex of royal concepts informs the evangelist's portrayal of the individual Son of God, who is anointed with the Spirit and triumphs over evil powers in

---

1 J. M. Miller, "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," *JBL* 91 (1972) 289-304, esp. pp. 294-297, 304 n. 41; G. E. Mendenhall, "II. The Mask of Yahweh," *The Tenth Generation. The Origins of the Biblical Tradition* (Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) 32-66, with the work of Ernst H. Kantorowicz mentioned in n. 1 on p. 32; Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 268-275.
Much of the older literature on sacral kingship is conveniently found in S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956) 21-186. Further in Brueggemann, "Kingship and Chaos," 318-320; Schlisske, *Gottessöhne*, 78-115; W. Wifall as in n. 1 on p. 186; Eaton, *Psalms*, 135-200; Becker, *Messiaserwartung*, 34-41.

2 More luridly mythological are Isa 14:9-15 and Ezek 28:11-19, on which see E. Haag, *Der Mensch am Anfang. Die Alttestamentliche Paradiesvorstellung nach Gn 2-3* (Trierer Theologische Studien, 24: Trier: Paulinus, 1970) 73-94, 106-116, 122-127.

3 Cf. Dumortier, "Ps. LXXXIX," 189: "Cette exaltation de la toute puissance de Yahvé est en effet la condition préalable à tout discours cohérent sur le caractère salvifique de la royauté davidique."
The Christian significance of Ps 89 has been exuberantly expressed by E. C. Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament* (London, etc.: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d. [1912]) xvi: "It contains . . . His Pre-existence, the guidance for His travels, His claim as David's son, His Prayer, His rejection, . . . His ultimate Resurrection, His names, Firstborn, Elect, Christ, and a strong confirmation of His name, Son of Man."

inaugurating the Kingdom of God. His Davidic eternity is understood as incorruption in Acts 2:22-36 and 13:29-30. But the prime example of the New Testament association of kingship, creation, and redemption, is Colossians 1:12-20. This passage is hymnic, and probably draws on Jewish liturgical phraseology.[1] Much of the venerable royal terminology is pressed into service: Father and Son, inheritance, darkness versus light (war), kingdom of the beloved, firstborn of all creation,[2] image of God, the beginning,[3] and making peace. Much of this vocabulary is not novel to the Egypt or Mesopotamia of the second or first millenium B.C. Spirit and king are joined in 1 Samuel 10:6; 16:13-14; 2 Samuel 23:2; Isaiah 11:2.

The second interlocking subject is the Temple on Mount Zion. The mystique of the Temple has been sketched on page 192. Its foundation stone, the *Eben Shetiyah*, is the base of the world, blocking up the entrance to the primal abyss and Sheol. The Temple is the navel of the universe. It even pre-existed in heaven according to Ezekiel, Chronicles, *Jubilees*, *1 Enoch*, *Testament of Levi*, the *Assumption of Moses*, and *2 Baruch*.[4] Therefore, the Temple is linked with creation and has cosmic significance. It is also a power for salvation. This is most evident in the atoning sacrifices, but the eschatological river is the most graphic instance. The Shekinah abides there; the Torah goes out from Jerusalem; the forces of

---

1 S. Lyonnet, *Annotationes in Epistulam ad Colossenses* (Romae: [Pontificium Institutum Biblicum], 1968/69) 68-71, who traces influences of the interconnected Yom Kippur and New Year liturgies.

2 Πρωτότοκος is a many-splendoured word. Its royal connotation is clear in Rev 1:5, where it is immediately followed by "the ruler (ἄρχων) of kings on earth," and a context reminiscent of Col 1:18. This regal colouring has been noted by J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Revised ed. 1879; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970 reprint) 147 col. 2; Longenecker, *Christology*, 53-58; A. van Roon, "The Relation between Christ and the Wisdom of God according to Paul," *NovT* 16 (1974) 207-239, 235-237. See further R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam. A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966) 97-98.

3 See references in preceding note. A connection with a text on the royal primacy of wisdom is argued by T. F. Glasson, "Colossians I 18 and Sirach XXIV," *NovT* 11 (1969) 154-156. P. Prigent ("In Principio. A propos d'un livre récent," *RHPR* 54 [1974] 391-399) adduces intriguing, if inconclusive, texts of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, suggesting that Gen 1:1 *Tg. Neof.* may be original: "From the beginning with wisdom the Son of the Lord perfected the heavens and the earth."

4 R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "The temple and the origins of Jewish apocalyptic," *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15, 1-6.

evil will not prevail against it since - as the Psalms of Zion proudly proclaim - it rests on the pillars of the world. Although one cannot speak of an explicit correlation of the Temple and the spirit in the Old Testament, the notions of כבוד/δόξα and Shekinah, coupled with the function of the sanctuary as the place of oracles, prepared the way for the New Testament and rabbinical association of Temple and Spirit.[1]

The Temple preserves its creative and redemptive significance in the New Testament. All four Gospels speak of the new Temple of King Jesus.[2] The Book of Revelation is most explicit about the New Jerusalem coming down from heaven, which will dispense with a special holy place. Christians are recreated as the stones or sons of the new Temple. John has the stream of living water flowing from the body of Jesus the King. The magi go to Jerusalem for enlightenment, whence the good news of grace radiates. Paul sees the Body of Christ, and the body of the baptized, as the Temple of the Holy Spirit.

As well as the king and the Temple, it is clear that wisdom possesses creative and redemptive functions. Bearing in mind the fact that creation in the Old Testament is often what today would be called the ordering of pre-existent material,[3] wisdom appears as the architectonic principle in the structure of the universe, e.g., Sirach 1 and 24. She is a tree of life and establishes the world, Proverbs 3:18-20. "Wisdom is like a goddess of life and a primal guardian over the 'way of life' and 'paths that

---

1 Ezekiel introduces his Torah of the last days, chs. 40-48, with the phrase, שפכתי את־רוחי על־בית ישראל, which conjures up the idea, "I, Yahweh, have poured forth my Spirit on the *Temple* of Israel" (Ezek 39:29) This would be consonant with the prophet's vision of the stream of life issuing from under the Temple, 47:1-12. After the destruction of the sanctuary in 586 it was later considered that the holy spirit had departed from Israel (Str-B 2. 133). But in the last age, rabbis believed, the spirit would return to the new Temple. So close is the connection that one scholar believes רוח הקדש originally meant "Spirit of the Holy Place"; cf. P. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (SANT 28; München: Kösel, 1972) 73-88, 112-115.

2 See p. 181, esp. the works cited in n. 5, e.g., Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 127-209.

3 Further in D. J. McCarthy, "'Creation' Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry," *CBQ* 29 (1967) 393-406, 394-397. He observes, "Israel seems to have done something quite new in applying these 'creation' words [קנה, בון, ילד: Deut 32:6, 18; Ex 15:16] to the description of its position as a saved and chosen people among peoples all under God's guidance" (p. 400).

lead to life' . . . Like the *gebirah* of Israel, she is the power behind the throne and the community."[1] As the time of Christ approaches, she is equated with the Torah (Ezra 7:25-26; Sirach 24:23-29; Baruch 4:1; *11QPsalms*[a] 18:14; *1 Enoch* 99:10), which in turn is conceived as eternal and the structural principle of the cosmos, e.g., Sirach 24:22 and Psalm 19.[2] Within a century of Matthew's time Pseudo-Solomon dwelt on the saving power of wisdom, Wisdom 9:18; 10:4; 14:4; 16:7 and 11; 18:5 and 7.[3] He also wrote, "Who ever knew your counsel, except you had given Wisdom and sent your holy spirit from on high?" (9:17). Here the connection between wisdom and spirit is explicit.[4]

The wisdom that his scriptures see involved in creation, redemption, and the work of the spirit, is considered by Matthew to be embodied and operative in Jesus. The interpenetration of the Christ and Wisdom is seen by the evangelist (and also probably by Paul) in his execution of the will of his Father and his living out of the Torah.[5] Thus Matthew and the New Testament are sensitive to the normative kingly wisdom of the Messiah.

The king, the Temple, and Wisdom are not conjoined simply because all three are cosmic and salvific forces which are energized by the Spirit. They also belong together because the king is founder and guardian of the Temple, and the paragon of wisdom. David, and even more Solomon, are the patrons of wisdom and the powerful speech it shapes: judgment, prophecy,

---

1 N. C. Habel, "The Symbolism of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9," *Int* 26 (1972) 131-157, at pp. 151-152 and 154.

2 Cf. Porteous, "Royal Wisdom," 256; M. Limbeck, *Die Ordnung des Heils. Untersuchungen zum Gesetzesverständnis des Frühjudentums* (KomBeiANT; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971), e.g., Kap. III "Der ordnende Wille Gottes," pp. 51-62; Kap. IV "Die Ordnung des Geschaffenen als das umfassende und primäre Gesetz," pp. 63-90.

3 See P. Beauchamp, "Le salut corporel des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse," *Bib* 45 (1964) 491-526; Reese, *Hellenistic Influence*, 68-69.

4 The wider OT background is found in P. van Imschoot, "Sagesse et l'esprit dans l'Ancien Testament," *RB* 47 (1938) 23-49; Porteous, "Royal Wisdom," 225.

5 See above pp. 148 with n. 2, 176-177, 216-217. Also, Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, Law*; Gibbs, as in n. 4 on p. 219. For Paul, cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (2d ed.; London: SPCK, 1955) 147-150, 168-176; A. Feuillet, *Christologie paulinienne et tradition biblique* ([Paris:] Desclée De Brouwer, 1973) 54-56.

psalmody, and exorcism. This is apparent in the early Christian era from the writings ascribed to them, for instance, the Qumran psalms, the Wisdom, *Psalms*, and *Odes of Solomon*. Wisdom is associated with Jerusalem, where she has taken up her abode. She has pitched her tent there, Sirach 24:8-11. This recalls the ancient cosmic tent of the gods,[1] and the tabernacle of David.[2] There is an obvious correlation in Proverbs 8:22-31 between the temple symbolism and wisdom as begotten by Yahweh and his primal confidant.[3] Isaiah's vision of the spirit penetrating the Son of David in 11:1-2 is echoed in Proverbs 8:12-14. This same spirit is linked with the Temple by the rabbis, and by some inspired Christian authors.[4] Wisdom 9:17 even identifies the holy spirit with wisdom. Therefore, the idea of the monarch and the spirit, even his spirit, bind together the Temple and wisdom. Thus the king, the Temple, and wisdom form a mutually interacting and enriching triad. Also, each enjoys creative and redemptive functions, and is connected with the divine spirit. Five of these realities may be seen to fuse

---

1 See R. J. Clifford, "The Tent of El and the Israelite Tent of Meeting," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 221-227; N. C. Habel, "'He Who stretches out the Heavens,'" *CBQ* 34 (1972) 417-430. Habel (pp. 426-427) has the apposite suggestion that David's pitching of the cultic tent was a rite imitating Yahweh's "pitching the heavens" as a tent. In other words, the king's sacred tent symbolized his pretensions to rule the world as son and heir to Yahweh.

2 This tabernacle was a subject of interest in Mt's time. 4QFlor cites 2 Sam 7:11c-14, and continues: "He is the Branch (סוכה, *sôkah*) of David . . . As it is written, I will raise up the tent (סוכה, *sûkkah*) of David that is fallen (Amos 9:11). That is to say, the Branch (סוכה) of David who shall arise to save Israel." Compare Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 246. The first evangelist is also captivated by the Branch of David in 2:23. James uses the same verse of Amos in a missionary sense to justify the reception of the Gentiles, "a people for his name" who serve to re-erect the world-spanning tabernacle of David, Acts 15:13-19. See Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 63-64; despite the reservation of Dumais, *Le langage de l'évangélisation*, 175-176.

3 Cf. W. McKane, *Proverbs. A New Approach* (OT Library; London: SCM, 1970) 350-358; Habel, "The Symbolism of Wisdom," 155-156.

4 For the rabbis see P. Schäfer in p. 228 n. 1. On the Spirit, water, and blood issuing from Christ in the context of the feasts of Passover and Tabernacles, and the related notion of the Spirit and life flowing from the new Temple, see J. Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1960) 333-347; Brown, *John*, 326-329, 331 (bibliography), 949-955; D. J. Murphy, "Ezekiel and the New Temple," *TBT* 40 (1969) 2805-2809. On the Body/body as temple of the Spirit see B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: University Press, 1965) 49-71, 138-142; McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 98-122.

in the sixth: temple, wisdom, creation, redemption, and spirit *blend in the royal aura*. "Solomon" expresses this clearly about a century before the time of Matthew:

> God of my fathers, Lord of mercy,
> you have *made all things* by your word . . .
> Give me *Wisdom*, the attendant at your throne,
> and reject me not from among your children (παιδων) . . .
> You have chosen me *king* over your people . . .
> You have bid me build a *temple* on your holy mountain
> and an altar in the city that is your dwelling place, . . .
> Who ever knew your counsel, except you had given Wisdom
> and sent your *holy spirit* from on high?
> And thus . . . men learned what was your pleasure,
> and were *saved* by Wisdom (NAB).

Wisdom 9:1-18 is a liturgy of royal wisdom[1] explicitly mentioning the chosen Davidic king and servant, creation, primordial wisdom, temple, holy spirit, and salvation. It is true that all these depend on the Lord of mercy. But here they revolve around the worshipping king. "The chasm between man and God is bridged only by the mystical figure of the Anointed who, by the mystery of the divine decree, is both human and divine."[2]

The preceding six pages have sketched how the Bible (especially in some hymnic sections) has connected wisdom and temple with the Davidic king - and creation, salvation, and the spirit with all three. In the religious moulding of Israel these five realities cluster around the significiant individual, the king. At the threshold of Christianity there existed a mystical respect for the Davidic guarantor of the Temple, for the all-wise Anointed, for the spirit-filled monarch at Jerusalem whose righteousness brought shalom, and who shared as Son and heir the cosmic sway of Yahweh - in particular by his power over the evil spirits.[3] The opening chapter of

---

1 See further Reese, *Hellenistic Influence*, 71-87: "The Anthroplogy of the Book of Wisdom against the Background of the Hellenistic Kingly Ideal."

2 Rylaarsdam, "The Two Covenants," 262.

3 "By the beginning of the Christian era the Davidic hope, expressed in the language of the Deuteronomist, the Chronicler, and the Psalms, as well as the prophets, particularly Isaiah, had reached its fullest development": J. F. A. Sawyer, *From Moses to Patmos. New Perspectives in Old Testament Study* (London: SPCK, 1977) 55. Mowinckel (*He That Cometh*, 379-383) indicates sacral kingship imagery in 2 Esdr, *1 Enoch*, and *T. Levi*; cf. references to L.Jansen and G. Widengren on remnants of Judaean royal ritual in *T. 12 Patr.* in Duling, "Promises," 66 n. 2. J. J. Collins' study of Dan 7 compels him to try to account for the availability of Canaanite royal mythology about 150 B.C. (*Apocalyptic Vision*, 101-104).

John, Colossians, Hebrews, and Revelation reveals how this spirituality left its impress on Christians. The Gospel portrait or, rather, motion picture of Jesus, the Son of David and beloved Son of God, shepherding the Twelve tribes in the power of the Spirit, living out the Torah, Isaiah, and his forefather's Psalms, symbolically taking possession of Jerusalem, cleansing the old Temple, and proclaiming the New, teaching, healing, and judging there, and redeeming and being exalted above all creation in the holy city, gains body and definition - and devotional dynamism - when viewed against a faith nourished on Davidic mysticism. Truly "the benefits assured to David under the covenant" have been lavished on Jesus.[1]

Matthew's Gospel of the Origins shares the lynchpin of this Davidic mystique - Yahweh Melek legitimating his Son and heir on Zion. The *genesis* that initiates the final economy (1:1, 18), the *salvation* it brings "his people," and the activity of the *Holy Spirit* begetting the Davidic Son of God, are wholly in context. Hartmut Gese proposes an increasing convergence of the Davidid's physical birth and his enthronement - from the inaugural Psalms 2:7 and 110:3, through the oracular Isaiah 7:14 and 9:5-6, to the interpenetration of redeeming, pre-existent royal wisdom and the Jerusalem Son and heir to Yahweh. Ultimately, he holds, the actual birth and enthronement coincide in the hidden work of the Spirit in Matthew 1.[2] This gradation is too neat, too contrived. But the fact remains that the development of royal theology was the main factor preparing for the conception of the Son of David and of God through the Holy Spirit. The meagre

---

1 This is the fine rendering by the *NAB* of Isa 55:3 (cf. 2 Chron 6:42), as cited by Paul in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, Acts 13:34. *Ḥesed*, the keyword of the Davidic covenant or promise, is never used of the Sinai covenant. This version brings out the grace element of the objective genitive, which reflects 2 Sam 7:15-16 and Ps 89:28-29. See further H. G. M. Williamson, "'The Sure Mercies of David': Subjective or Objective Genitive?," *JSS* 23 (1978) 31-49, esp. pp. 43-44, 49. The same idea that the Davidic rulers were "confirmed in grace" may earlier have led to the cryptic cherishing of Nehemiah's royal descent; cf. W. Th. in der Smitten, "Erwägungen zur Nehemias Davidizität," *JSJ* 5 (1974) 41-48. Compare the respect of Deutero-Zechariah for the House of David-Elohim in 12:7-13:1. See also Seybold, "Wiederkunft," 108; Tournay, "Zacharie XII-XIV," 362-363; and p. 197 above.
If, as J. D. Levenson argues ("The Promise to the Rechabites," *CBQ* 38 [1976] 508-514), the loyalty of the donee of a Grant Covenant must be unique in its time, and the critical generation was not that of David, then Jesus' Davidic credentials and virtue sealed the royal covenant.

2 "Natus ex virgine," 76-89.

evidence outside the texts listed above may be divided into three classes: Yahweh as creator of the Judaean king in the womb in Psalm 139:13-15 ("Thou didst knit me together in my mother's womb . . . when I was being made in secret, intricately wrought in the depths of the earth"), and his birth-helper in Psalms 22:9-10 and 71:5;[1] secondly, the intertestamental interest in the awesome origins of the cosmos,[2] and even of David;[3] and, lastly, the assimilation of Adam to Christ, and vice versa.[4] These are parallel paths to explore in order to feel with a first century heart the gracious consistency of Yahweh in the conception of the Son of David by the virgin through the Holy Spirit.

---

1 See Eaton, *Psalms*, 84, 147-148.

2 The Priestly writer shows great interest in ultimate origins, and the hierarchy of being they establish. Cf. P. Beauchamp, *Création et séparation. Étude exégétique du premier chapitre de la Genèse* (Bibliothèque de Sciences Religieuses; Paris: Aubier, etc., 1969) 268-344, esp. pp. 332-336, "Alliance cultuelle et cosmologie." Later the same interest manifests itself in extracanonical writings - P. W. Skehan, "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 343-347.

3 Note the enigmatic *Bib. Ant.* 60:3 (and see 23:7-8), where David rehearses the order of creation, silences Saul's evil spirit as a creation of the second day, "secunda creatura," and concludes: "Arguet autem te metra nova unde natus sum, de qua nascetur post tempus de lateribus meis qui vos domabit." This *metra nova* baffles commentators, since it is apparently independent of individual monarchs, and even of time. See the variety of conjectures in Bogaert, etc., *Pseudo-Philon*, 2. 235-236. A fresh interpretation may be proposed. Is there here a residue of some mythical womb of kings, where the future crown prince is formed before the Dawn (ἀνατολή!) - Pss 110:3; 139:15; Isa 14:12? And may one superimpose the more prosaic notion that the "new womb" signifies the royal παρθένος-wife who has not yet borne a child, but is destined to give birth to the "firstborn" son and heir (Isa 7:14LXX and n. 4 on p. 67)? A virgin womb, the *metra nova*, can produce the Messiah of David only under the influence of the divine name (cf. "nomen tuum" in 60:2). That is why Mt insists that "the Lord" had said, "a virgin shall conceive and bear a son" (1:22-23), and "I called my son" (2:15). See also the thought-provoking invocation of the esoteric *Maaseh Bereshith* in relation to *Bib. Ant.* 60:2-3 by M. Philonenko, "Remarques sur un hymne essénien de caractère gnostique," *Sem* 11 (1961) 43-54, esp. pp. 48-50.

4 More than the Synoptics, Paul and John draw on Gen 2-3; cf. Wifall, "Protevangelium," 364-365, on Jesus as "Adam-David" in the NT. Yet the possible royal overtones of "Son of Man" (see pp. 186 n. 1, 173 n. 2), joined to the theme of *genesis* in Mt 1, might just conceivably suggest Adam-David. C. H. Gordon ("Paternity at Two Levels," *JBL* 96 [1977] 101) concludes about Jesus' divine and Davidic paternity: "The royal genealogy of Christ through Joseph is not a paradox in the realm of Near East concepts existing from the Bronze Age to Roman times."

Already in pre-Christian Judaism the *mythical* concerning creation, primordial royal wisdom structuring the cosmos, the holy king whose righteousness saves and supports the world, his temple as navel of the earth, and the spirit active among men and focused in the Son of Jesse, has become the *mystical*, the reverential language of the ineffable. The regal ministry of Jesus the Christ in Matthew 3-28 (as commented on in pages 170-200), the sermons of Acts 2 and 13, and the hymnic or credal passages in John 1, Colossians 1, Hebrews 1, and Revelation 1, provide a good background to understanding Matthew 1, and even chapter 2. These passages furnish a spiritual savour and a theological idiom for appreciating the genesis and legitimation of the Davidic Son of the Lord God in Matthew 1 and 2:5-6, 15, 23. In Matthew 22:43 (compare Mark 12:36) Jesus pointed to this irreducible and inviting dimension of mystery - If King David ἐν πνεύματι calls the Christ "*Kyrios*," how can he be his son? Consequently, it is scarcely an exaggeration to state that Matthew 1-2 is bathed in the atmosphere of centuries-old, even millenial, Jewish, and now Christian,[1] royal mysticism.[2]

---

1 See H. Riesenfeld, "The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology," *The Gospel Tradition. Essays by Harald Riesenfeld* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970 [originally published 1956]) 31-49, esp. pp. 35-42; N. Q. King, "Kingship as Communication and Accomodation," *Promise and Fulfilment. Essays presented to Professor S. H. Hooke in celebration of his ninetieth birthday, 21st January 1964, by members of the Society for Old Testament Study and others* (ed. F. F. Bruce; Edinburgh: Clark, 1963) 142-162, esp. pp. 147-154 on the NT and on the hellenized Syrian, Eusebius of Caesarea; J. F. X. Sheehan, *Let the People Cry Amen!* (An Exploration Book; New York, etc.: Paulist Press, 1977) 125-138.
Outside Mt, Acts, Rom, and Rev, the Isaianic royal theology is being discerned in midrashic form in John, e.g., Isa 11:1-4 in Jn 1:32-51 according to Betz, "Kann denn aus Nazareth"; Isa 9:5 in Jn 12:34, "The Christ remains for ever" - B. McNeil, "The Quotation at John XII 34," *NovT* 19 (1977) 22-33; and also in Eph - Isa 9:5-6 and 57:7, 19, in the view of P. Stuhlmacher, "'Er ist unser Friede' (Eph 2:14). Zur Exegese und Bedeutung von Eph 2,14-18," *Neues Testament und Kirche* (ed. J. Gnilka), pp. 337-358.

2 W. B. Tatum ("Origin of Jesus Messiah," 534) concludes from the structure and prophetic geography of Mt 1-4: "The genealogy (1:1-17) and the first main section of the Gospel (1:18-4:16), therefore, represent not the transcendence but the triumph of Davidic messianism."
On the Christian afterlife of sacral kingship see S. Runciman, *The Byzantine Theocracy* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977) 1-4, 12-13, 19, 22; W. A. Chaney, *The Cult of Kingship in Anglo-Saxon England. The Transition from Paganism to Christianity* (Manchester: University Press, 1970) 43-120, 174-220, 251-259: E. H. Kantorowicz, as in n. 1 on p. 226.

c. Three Objections answered

Several difficulties may be raised about interpreting the genesis of the Son of the Lord God against the background of the divine legitimation of the Davidic kings. First, and most obvious, there is the methodological query. The royal theology of the divine king with his wisdom and temple is influential in Matthew. But the associated triad of creation, salvation, and spirit, plays a real, yet restricted, part. This may be conceded. However, redaction analysis is not the sole tool of exegesis. In every Gospel there are some pericopes whose individuality stands out. In the First Gospel these include the promise to Peter (16:16-19), the shekel in the fish's mouth (17:27), the dream of Pilate's wife (27:19), and the apocalyptic convulsions and apparitions at the death of Jesus (27:52-53). These passages usually betray Matthean traits, but they are to various degrees free-standing. They simply are not explicable solely from the Gospel. In practice, commentators on these verses adduce similarities with intertestamental literature, Qumran, or rabbinic and midrashic writings, to aid their comprehension. Since Matthew only once mentions the creative Spirit in direct relation to Jesus, it is inevitable that composition analysis should be unable to furnish a total explanation. But the evangelist's strongly Davidic context justifies recourse to the canonical royal mystique, which does leave its mark elsewhere in the New Testament and his Gospel. Moreover, the occurrence of something only once in Matthew may not signify that the evangelist attaches to it little importance. Frequent mention does not guarantee clarity, as evidenced by the debate whether the Kingdom of God is present or future, or both simultaneously. Neither does a brief mention betoken insignificance, as witnessed by the importance for Christians of the Holy Spirit and *agapē*, despite the comparative reticence on these topics of the evangelical Jesus.[1]

A second objection appears more weighty. The Holy Spirit of Matthew 1:18 and 20 begets Jesus the Messiah. This is unexpected, not only in the royal tradition, but in view of the biblical, intertestamental, and rabbinical writings, where the spirit is nearly always prophetic and moral, rather than creative (see page 32). Nevertheless there may be antecedents

---

1 Compare the important methodological essay by G. R. Beasley-Murray, "Jesus and the Spirit," *Mélanges Rigaux* (ed. A. Descamps), pp. 463-478.

for the role of the Spirit in Matthew 1. If *Genesis Rabbah* 2:4 contains pre-Christian material, then the spirit of Genesis 1:2 is identified with the spirit of the Messiah in Isaiah 11:2. *Exodus Rabbah* 48:4 cites Ezekiel 37:14 in support of the divine assurance that in this age the spirit gives wisdom, but that in the age to come it will give life. But if the Old Testament does not link the spirit with the origin of the Davidids, it does involve the spirit in their legitimation. Whether in First Samuel 16 or Isaiah 11:2-4, 42:1, 61:1-3, the kingly anointing signifies penetration by the enabling spirit.[1] The three instances of "holy spirit" in the Hebrew canon concern authority - Isaiah 63:10-11, and David's appeal in Psalm 51:11, "Take not thy holy spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of thy salvation, and may the royal spirit uphold me."[2] From being the possession of the monarch alone it spreads out to make the Lord's anointed the spirit or principle of life of his people (Lamentations 4:20). A final consideration is that Wisdom 9:17-18 equates the holy spirit with saving wisdom. But in Wisdom 1:14 all births seem to be designated as saving: σωτήριοι αἱ γενέσεις τοῦ κόσμου.[3] Σωτήριος occurs only here and in Amos 5:22. Therefore its rarity could connect it with the repeated later assertions that wisdom saves. Consequently, the possibility suggests itself that "Solomon" sees the wise spirit at work in saving births. This is very far from assured, yet the previous texts illustrate how the Davidic king was the bearer par excellence of the spirit of God. Therefore, it is not wholly revolutionary that the Holy Spirit should, in God's good time, beget the Son of David who was legitimated as the Son of God.

A third difficulty about a Davidic origin for the conception of the Son of God by the Holy Spirit arises from systematic theology. Several contemporary theologians link the divinity of Christ with the Spirit, without

---

1 Cf. Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 246-251; Weisman, "Anointing," 381, 394-398. In keeping with this outlook the Synoptics assert that whoever does not recognize the Spirit at work in Jesus belongs to another aeon, and cannot be with the King in the Kingdom he inaugurates, Mt 12:32parr.

2 The translation is that of Eaton, *Psalms*, 157, cf. p. 71. Despite Hill (*Greek Words*, 210-211 n. 2) there is more than a moral quality involved.

3 Translations vary: "The world's created things have health in them" (*JB*); "The creative forces of the world make for life" (*New English Bible*); "The creatures of the world are wholesome" (*NAB*). Reese (*Hellenistic Influence*, 68) follows F. R. Tennant (*JTS* 2 [1901] 218) in rendering, "Births are saving for the world."

adverting to the royal element. Wolfhart Pannenberg comes near to saying the Risen Christ and the Spirit are identical. He does state that the Trinitarian dogma of 381, which declares the Holy Spirit to be the third "person" in God beside the Father and the Son, leads beyond the concepts expressed by Paul and probably by John also.[1] G. W. H. Lampe advocates a Spirit christology which defines the godhead of Jesus in terms of inspiration, indwelling, and possession by the Spirit.[2] Another expresses it thus: "The impersonal Spirit, like the impersonal Logos, is now identified with Jesus and bears his personality. In other words as the Spirit is the divinity of Jesus, so Jesus is the personality of the Spirit."[3] Such a christology could drive a wedge between the carnal Son of David and the "Pneumatic" Son of God.

The clearest New Testament basis for this view is 2 Corinthians 3:17, "When a man turns to the Lord the veil is removed. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." There is a variety of opinions concerning the exact meaning of, "The Lord is the Spirit."[4] The context is midrashic, and it is significant that *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* Numbers 7:89 and Exodus 33:16 calls Yahweh the "(Holy) Spirit" in so far as he reveals his designs to Moses. In Paul too the "Spirit" could be Yahweh, or, more precisely, the pre-existent Christ active in the old dispensation.[5] There is, therefore, no necessity to hold that Paul equates

---

1 *Jesus: God and Man*, 169-179, esp. pp. 177-179. A useful summary, and development, of similar work by Pannenberg, H. Mühlen, and W. Kasper, is found in P. J. Rosato, "Spirit Christology: Ambiguity and Promise," *TS* 38 (1977) 423-449, esp. pp. 436-447.

2 "The Holy Spirit and the Person of Christ," *Christ, Faith and History* (ed. S. W. Sykes), 111-130; *God as Spirit. The Bampton Lectures, 1976* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), e.g. pp. 61-94, 120-175.

3 J. D. G. Dunn, "Rediscovering the Spirit, I," *ExpT* 84 (1972/73) 7-12, 12; cf. his *Jesus and the Spirit*, 320-326.

4 These views are tabulated and weighed by A. Giglioli, "Il Signore e lo Spirito," *RivB* 20 (1972) 263-276; Greenwood, "The Lord is the Spirit," 467-472.

5 For this interpretation see McNamara, *NT and Palestinian Targum*, 182-188. Greenwood ("The Lord is the Spirit," 470) writes aptly, "I prefer to think of him as writing *kurios* in 17a with the notion of *Yahweh in Christ* at the back of his mind"; C. F. D. Moule, "The New Testament and the Doctrine of the Trinity: a short report on an old theme," *ExpT* 88 (1976/77) 16-20, 18 with n. 12. This solution is quite compatible with J. Swetnam on R. Penna's *Lo Spirito di Cristo* in *Bib* 58 (1977) 589-590.

the Holy Spirit with Christ in glory. Indeed, Matthew and Luke recognize three epochs of the Spirit. For Matthew, Jesus is first the creation of the Spirit (1:18-20); next he is bearer of the Spirit (3:16; 4:1; 12:18 and 20); and lastly he hints that after the resurrection he will be the dispenser of the Spirit (3:11; 10:20; 27:50).[1]

James Swetnam explains Romans 1:3-4 in this way: "The pre-existent son became 'of David' according to the flesh, while according to the Spirit he is of 'the resurrection from the dead', i.e., of a metahistorical existence. It is in this latter capacity that the son was 'defined' as son of God in power, i.e., was shown to be what he actually was before sharing in the seed of David."[2] This interpretation is valid - as far as it goes. However, three elements of the Romans credal tag are tributary to the Davidic theology: son of God, spirit (of holiness), and raised up. The κατὰ σάρκα is absolutely necessary for the κατὰ πνεῦμα. Thus there need be no tension between the pneumatic Christ and the Davidic Son of God, if it is kept in mind that the density of the "spiritization" of the Christ derives in part from the royal spirit of the Jewish heritage.

d. The Transmission of the Davidic Mystique to Matthew

One possible avenue was faith seeking understanding through searching the scriptures for Jesus the Christ. Yet that christology had purely literary and exegetico-midrashic origins is incredible. Scholars have made a number of suggestions regarding the transmission of the royal theology. The learned circles who had access to the pre-exilic court, such as scribes and religious personnel, may have been a channel.[3] Others think of a

---

1 Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, "Spirit and Kingdom," *ExpT* 82 (1970/71) 36-40, 39.

2 *Bib* 58 (1977) 589; cf. above p. 151 n. 4, and p. 196 n. 2. The paradoxical mingling of being the Son and becoming the Son has been well expressed by B. Sesboué, "Bulletin de théologie dogmatique: Christologie," *RSR* 61 (1973) 423-465: "En Jésus la filiation éternelle se fait temporalité historique: ce n'est donc qu'au terme de l'histoire humaine de Jésus que celui-ci peut être reconnu de manière définitive comme le Fils. L'être-Fils de Jésus prend le caractère d'un devenir-Fils, bien que nous devions dire à la lumière du terme qu'il était dès le commencement ce Fils-devenu" (p. 426).

3 See Sheehan, *Let the People Cry Amen!*, 125-138; Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 102 (mentioning Philo of Byblos). Apocalypticists are cited by Hanson, "Zechariah 9," 57-59; Rylaarsdam, "The Two Covenants," 266-267. The latter may have belonged to this élite.

revival of Jerusalem royal ritual under the Hasmonean priest-kings.[1] John Eaton has made out a strong case for the Psalms containing a dramatic presentation of the ideal of the Davidic office, very probably in conjunction with the celebration of the kingship of Yahweh at the autumn festival. Many psalms portray the Judaean king as enjoying a highly personal relation with Yahweh, as his very son and covenant-partner, as aided by his word and spirit, as protected by the angelic graces and delivered from death into abundant life, as sharing in God's universal dominion, and as leading in a worship comprising atonement, intercession, revelation, and evangelical witness.[2] The psalm titles evince a lively, personal, "Davidic" piety at the time of Matthew, as described on pages 160-165. This fact alone could indicate why the royal mystique seems to have been close to the heart of the audience of Matthew.

Perhaps these three suggested channels of transmission - learned or apocalyptic circles, Hasmonean dynastic rites, and a devotional life nourished on the psalter - coalesced in that post-exilic Autumn festival, about which so much is posited, and relatively little known. The great experience of Israel's faith and hope was the climactic seventh month of Tishri, which contained, probably, a New Year ceremony, and certainly Yom Kippur and Tabernacles. The Feast of Booths is called simply "the feast" in 2 Chronicles 7:9, and "a most holy and important festival" by Josephus.[3]

---

1 Cf. Borsch, *Son of Man*, 162-167; Duling, "Promises," 66, 77.

2 Eaton, *Psalms*, 87-200, esp. pp. 102-111, 131-134, 199.

3 "ἑορτῆς σφόδρα . . . ἁγιωτάτης καὶ μεγίστης" (*Ant.* 5, §100). New Year and Tabernacles may be viewed as overlapping. See further the art. "Nouvel An," *DBSup* 6 (1960), cols. 555-645, esp. "III. Dans le Judaïsme" (A. Michel); "IV. Le Nouvel An en Israël" (H. Cazelles), cols 597-645; G. W. MacRae, "The Meaning and Evolution of the Feast of Tabernacles," *CBQ* 22 (1960) 251-276; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (London: SPCK, 1966) 189-200; D. J. A. Clines, "New Year," *IDBSup*, 625-629, 627-628; Eaton, *Psalms*, 102-134.
The historical setting of many of the minor Prophets and of (proto-) apocalyptic is increasingly being seen as liturgical, and particularly in the New Year and Tabernacles rites. On this see J. Gray, "The Day of Yahweh in Cultic Experience and Eschatological Prospect," *SEÅ* 39 (1974) 5-37; J. D. W. Watts, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge: University Press, 1975), e.g. pp. 4-5, 13, 155. The cosmic and royal scenario of Tabernacles is clear in Zech 14:6-21. Cf. N. L. A. Tidwell, "*Wā'ōmar* (Zech 3:5) and the Genre of Zechariah's Fourth Vision," *JBL* 94 (1975) 343-355, esp. pp. 352-353; B. Halpern, *CBQ* 40 (1978) 167-190, esp. pp. 180-190.

The Sukkoth liturgy inspired John, and has been detected in the Synoptic accounts of the transfiguration and entry into Jerusalem.[1] But the influence of the autumnal rite may be more pervasive. Relying on hypothetically ritual passages from the prophets and psalms, and on rabbinical writings, it has been deduced with considerable probability that the first century Tishri feasts celebrated the royalty of Yahweh and his fidelity to his promises, creation, judgment and salvation.[2] These are precisely the interests of Matthew 1-2![3] In the Gospel of the Origins the kingship of the Lord God is represented by his Davidic Son, who is begotten through the Spirit at the end of the days (royalty and creative Spirit). As the Son of God and heir to the promises to David, the Christ has universal dominion (magi); and saves "his people," including Joseph, Mary, and the Gentiles. Herod and Jerusalem are condemned. Yahweh's fidelity to his promises to Abraham and David is vindicated, and those who claimed to read his mind are justified by the events - Isaiah, Micah, Samuel, Hosea, Jeremiah, and David. Legitimated by his very genesis as the Son of the Lord God, the Messiah could go forward to demonstrate his filial ability to learn from the Father, and by the power of the Spirit be his royal representative. In short, Jesus the Christ actualizes the ultimate mystery which Tishri celebrates.

---

1 For example, the stream of the Spirit in Jn 7:37-38, and "the light of the world" in 8:12; compare Rev 21:22-22:5. For the Synoptic episodes consult the commentaries. See also Lyonnet on Col 1 in n. 1 on p. 227; N. Hillyer, "First Peter and the Feast of Tabernacles," *TyndB* 21 (1970) 39-70.

2 For the details see Michel and Cazelles in n. 3 of p. 239, esp. the references to S. Mowinckel and H.-J. Kraus. M. D. Goulder ("The Fourth Book of the Psalter," *JTS* 26 [1975] 269-289) proposes the instructive, if inevitably speculative, theory that Pss 90-106 constitute a collection of psalms for Tabernacles. Certainly they contain the above themes.
Some use of the festal symbolism has been made to illuminate NT christology, such as the Davidic king as the son of Man (Adam), e.g., Thornton, *The Dominion of Christ*, 170-186; A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970) 73-80; Riesenfeld, "Mythological Background"; Fawcett, *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*, 57-68, 230-235, 291-293.

3 There is no implication here that a liturgy of the (still hypothetical) New Year and Tabernacles feast(s) provided a pattern for Mt 1-2. What is tentatively proposed is, that the evangelist's audience had been familiar with a Jewish Tishri celebration which disposed them to understand Jesus *experientially* as the Son of God who was the ultimate Son of David. Even if this hypothesis be judged too fragile, the data for which it tries to account remain: Davidic dynasty, Son of God, Spirit, creation or genesis, judgment and salvation, and the final fruition of the designs of Yahweh.

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

This work began by doubting both the necessity and the possibility of isolating the oral or written sources which Matthew may have used for his Gospel of the Origins (pages 16-22). A comparison of recent studies reveals a certain consensus emerging about the stories pre-dating the evangelist. A version of these traditions was offered in the form of a relatively coherent narrative - without either pretending to salvage the original wording, or accepting a further division into a putative Herod Source, or a Joseph Source, or a Dream Source, or a Magi Source. This material, even if it did exist in something like the form proposed, is greatly changed by its employment in a "Davidic" Gospel. The evangelist and his traditions interact to form a fresh composition with its own existence and qualities. It is this ultimate and canonical text whose richness is henceforth explored.

Chapter 2 examines the debt of Matthew 1-2 to its primary literary analogue, the Old Testament. Patriarchal, exodus and exile, and particularly Davidic, allusions are found. The genealogy proclaims Jesus the unique royal heir to the ancestral promises, and the Messiah destined to bring them into effect in these last days of grace. The remainder of the Gospel of the Origins - of the manifold genesis of the Christ - is certainly no mere distillation of Old Testament texts. There is a Genesis climate of interest in wife, son, and heir, in dreams and the angel of the Lord, and in the threat to life, and migration within and beyond the Land of Promise. Despite the atmosphere of a fresh and final beginning, the activity of the Spirit does not betoken a new Adam or a new creation, but rather the introduction of *the* Son of David, whom Chapter 7 will identify as the royal Son of God. The true David is found with his Queen Mother. He is acknowledged by his foreign subjects, but rejected by the insensitive custodians of the Word of the Lord in 2:1-12. The experience of Jewish, and doubtless later Christian, exodus and exile, diaspora and persecution, is refracted through the contempt of the Messiah in 2:13-23. Yet the Lord saves the righteous man.

The ethos of first century Judaism gives rise to a mode of experiencing and expressing religious reality which is often called midrash. Chapter 3 claims that this contemporary self-understanding of Judaism entails a symbiosis of Holy Word and holy living. It is a *Hermeneutik* which injects a devotional and moral vitality into Matthew's two opening chapters. The numerical ordering of 1:1-17 connotes the polarization of God's story in the Son of David, aided by five women who, it is seen on pages 118-119, proclaim the mysterious ways of providence overthrowing all human wisdom. The first disciple, Joseph, is both a man of principle and kind. Contrary to the opinion of many, the midrashic mentality does not reduce the conception of Jesus from the Spirit to a mere image of transcendence (pages 70-71), or give the magi and the star a purely literary existence (page 81), or categorize the Christ as the new Moses (pages 88-89). Indirectly, the investigation of the christology of Matthew in its Gospel setting points the way to a more nuanced understanding of reality as historical.

If the first three chapters constitute the outermost circle, chapters four and five form an inner circle, since they examine the immediate context of Matthew 1-2 - the milieu of the evangelist and the drama of his whole work. Matthew was almost certainly a Jew who embraced the "Messianity" of Jesus of Nazareth. He addressed a Greek-speaking audience which was in significant measure Gentile. His community regarded itself as the nucleus of Israel, among whom the divine promises were being fulfilled. It was outside the Synagogue system, yet apparently in debate with it.

If there is a grand design in the overall structure of the First Gospel, it has still to be discovered. Certainly the two opening chapters form a unit, with a hinge between the chapters. Yet they are associated with 3:1-4:16 as foundational, christophanic, narrative, remarkable for the special activity of the Holy Spirit (1:18-20; 3:11, 16; 4:1) and for prophetic geography. Matthew 1-2 show a certain kinship with chapters 26-28 in a similar alternation of scenes, and the prominence of such titles as Jesus-Saviour (of Nazareth), King of the Jews, Christ, and Son (of God). Moreover there is the same setting of acceptance by harried disciples, saving from sin, Jerusalem malevolence and misunderstanding of Scripture, and the pledge of grace. The paschal mystery is imprinted in the pre-baptism cycle. The Gospel's first two chapters are unlike a prologue in their cohesion with the rest of the work, and are aptly termed, "The Gospel of the Origins".

The core of this study is comprised of the sixth and seventh chapters, and occupies more than half its length. This third part of the work expounds the message of Matthew 1-2 as a christology shaped by the covenant with Saint David. Both chapter six and chapter seven draw on the essential preliminary examination of the general and immediate Gospel setting in the preceding five chapters. They consist of a two-stage christological exposition. Chapter 6 concentrates on the subjective element, the impact of the Messiah on the pseudo-Israel and on the true. The seventh chapter deals with the identity of the Christ, the objective element - christology in the current attenuated sense. Matthew's overall view of Jesus Christ is in accord with that of the rest of the New Testament, with its fusion of functional (subjective) and ontological (objective) dimensions. Matthew 1-2 cannot see the Christ as other than Jesus or Saviour. To coin a term for this outlook, the evangelist's christology in its Gospel setting is a *participatory christology*, in the sense that it involves the believer, transforms him, and concomitantly discerns him from the unbeliever.

The Old Testament shares this holistic attitude. Yahweh is not just ontologically "He who is," but is also functionally "He who is with us" in fidelity and loving-kindness. Yahweh and Israel are inseparable. They define each other. The Old Testament has perceptively been called, not a theology for man, but an anthropology for God (Abraham Heschel). The incarnational principle is not univocally Christian. Yahweh is the Lord of the Covenant, the One who is seized in a relationship: Immanuel. This holistic approach is discernible in the Gospel of the Origins. The experience of Jesus the Christ inspires a participatory or *covenant christology* welding the functional and ontological into a person and a community, a way of life and worship. For Matthew 1-2, therefore, christology is inseparable from soteriology, from grace, that is, the sharing in the sonship and destiny of Jesus the Messiah.

The Gospel of the Origins is not treated as an apologetic in Chapter 6, yet the evangelist reacts to the ambient disapproval and disbelief. His genealogy and account of the conception, Davidic legitimation, and naming of the child, advocate the characteristic gracious presence of the Lord in his Son. In turn, this coming of the Son of David and of God demands the cooperation of disciples, of Joseph and the magi, despite the opposition of the custodians of the Word of Yahweh. The stress on the fulfilment of

prophecy implies that the career of the Christ involves the fidelity or righteousness of the Lord and of the believer. The evangelist's selection of scripture shows how the Christ is the *Hermeneutik*, the ultimate catalyst allowing the past and present experience of Matthew's audience to fuse into a vital synthesis. In this fashion the Messiah of the new covenant is an "organism" capable of assimilating, purifying, and enriching the hopes and insights of his people.

Five times the explicit word of God testifies to the mystery of the obscurity and glory of the Son of the Lord God and of David. Matthew's christology is, in sum, a product of the assimilation of reverential questioning by insiders, hostility from uncomprehending outsiders, and the adaptation required by the unexpected yet foreordained enfleshing of the Son of God who is also the Son of David, by the widespread failure to recognize the Christ, and by the expansion of messianic Israel in "Galilee" among the outcasts and Gentiles. The sixth chapter, therefore, delineates what may be termed Matthew's "situation christology," rooted in a lived faith struggling for understanding.[1]

Finally, Chapter 7 completes the inquiry by probing the significance of the interrelated Davidic and divine sonship. Once again, this theology springs from a significant fact: Jesus was, according to the standards of his time, a scion of the royal house of Judah. *A* son of David through Joseph, he was legitimated as *the* Son of David and of the Lord God by the work of the Spirit and the will of the Father declared through the prophets in 1:23 and 2:15.

The vivid first century Jewish appreciation of the coming Son of David, and its understanding of human and royal sonship, colour much of the perception of Matthew, and are determinant for his Gospel of the Origins. The theology of kingship provides the language for relating to the significant individual - the Christ the Son of God. Only such Davidic mysticism had the filial and divine, the creational and salvific, and the individual and

---

1 See further the summary and application on pages 142-144. Recapitulations are also found on pp. 46-47 (OT resonance of Mt 1-2); 70 (uniqueness of the conception from the Spirit); 81 (the star and magi); 88-89 (relevance of Moses midrash); 96-97 (Mt's community); 108 (relation of Mt 1-2 to 26-28); 113 (the function of Mt 1-2); 130-131 (the corporate or subjective christology of 1:18-25). The lengthy Chapter 7 has résumés on pp. 149, 154, 157, 169, 200, 215, 221, and 234.

corporate dimensions which could do justice to the Christ. Matthew's penetration of the supreme dignity and ultimate sonship of Jesus Messiah was in part the fruit of the contemplation nurtured by the work most frequently cited in the New Testament, the psalter of Saint David, and by other writings belonging to what may be called the "Davidic canon" - Isaiah, Deutero-Zechariah, Chronicles, and Wisdom. The Holy Word was employed because it was realized then, as now, that only God can identify his Son. Then as now this sonship was mission as well as status. It entailed learning from the Father and being loyal to him, as well as filial legitimation. For the Christ this sonship was a unique birthright, a prototype, and a disclosure rather than an achievement (pages 169, 200, 215, 221, 234, 238).

Turning from retrospect to prospect, it may be asked if this evaluation of the christology of Matthew 1-2 in its Gospel setting sheds any light on contemporary theological concerns.

As already indicated in passing, historicity in the narrow sense of quantifiable phenomena, observable events, is not a direct interest of this work. Yet the investigation of Matthew 1-2 has underlined the passage's density and experiential texture. The pre-baptism cycle has its roots in authentic experience. There is no scope here for gnosticism, or the individualistic and psychical world of much existentialism and popular personalism. Historicity is established by interpretation. The Gospel of the Origins includes the response of acceptance and rejection. This greatly complicates the isolation of specific events. But, like all true history, these two chapters perpetuate the impact of real, even corporate, life.[1] Matthew 1 works from the accepted data that Jesus the Christ was a son of David, and the Son of the Lord God through the power of the Spirit in the virgin - as anticipated by Isaiah. In the second chapter there is, apparently, a symbiosis between Christ and his Body. During the first century many Gentiles satisfied their highest aspirations by yielding to the Christ. Yet the custodians of the Word of the Lord, unlike Matthew, were unable to penetrate the mystery of the scorned Messiah from Galilee.

---

1 On the historicity of Mt 1-2 see p. 81 with n. 1; also towards the end of n. 2 on p. 90, and n. 4 on p. 153. See further on the personalist factor in interpretation (pp. 56-57) and on "objectivity" (n. 1 on p. 116). The many relevant passages in Brown, *Messiah*, are listed in the Subject Index on p. 589.

Secondly, certain deficiencies of recent systematic christology have been indicated.[1] This study suggests that closer attention to the realia of first century life, especially Jewish piety, would be rewarding. Covenant christology signifies the injection of the believer into his belief, and consequently the elaboration of a praxis. Further exploration of the persona of Saint David in Matthew's milieu probably can shed more light on how the Messiah was assimilated into a religious life-style, an orthopraxis that constituted much of the earliest orthodoxy. The hagiography, the meditation, and the liturgical celebration (not merely the rites) of first century Judaism, must be more sympathetically understood. The felt appreciation of the participatory christology of Matthew will deepen as the axiom *lex orandi lex credendi* is verified during the formative decades of the Church. Probably further elucidation of the cosmic and salvific, the royal and divine, élan of the Tabernacles and New Year feasts will infuse fresh vitality into the originally lived and living Matthean christology. Indeed, for centuries after Matthew the Davidic mystique pervading the Psalms and Isaiah nourished pastoral and monastic christology.[2]

The framing phrase of the evangelist in 1:23 and 28:20 about Jesus the Christ, the Son of God and the Son of David, provides an apt conclusion. Matthew's covenant christology indicates that this doxology may be given a new emphasis. The Lord God declared of his Son:

"'His name shall be called *Emmanu*el' (which means, God *with us!*)."

---

1 See pp. 114-115; also, pp. 143-144 on the relational, and therefore corporate and patrocentric, character of christology; and p. 200 on the vibrant figure of Saint David almost wholly neglected by theology.

2 Jesus had the key of David (Rev 3:7), and opened up the Book of Psalms to Christians; cf. L. G. Walsh, "The Christian Prayer of the Psalms according to the 'Tituli Psalmorum' of the Latin Manuscripts," *Studies in Pastoral Liturgy 3* (ed. P. Murray; Dublin: Gill, 1967) 29-73, with works in n. 2 on p. 34; I. Saint-Arnaud, "Psaumes," *DBSup* 9 (1973), cols. 1-214, 210-214; above pp. 159 n. 2 and 234 n. 2. Ambrose wrote penetratingly of David: "huic soli palam atque aperte videtur esse promissum, ut Dominus Jesus ex eius semine nasceretur, sicut dixit ad eum Dominus: *De fructu ventris tui ponam super sedem tuam (Ps 131,11)*. In psalmis itaque non solum nascitur Jesus; sed etiam salutarem illam suscipit corporis passionem, quiescit, resurgit, ascendit ad coelum, sedet ad dexteram Patris. Id quod nemo praesumpserat hominum dicere, hoc solus hic propheta annuntiavit, postea ipse Dominus in Evangelio praedicavit *(Luc 24,44)*" (*PL* 14, col. 924).

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

The Bibliography has two sections:

A. Studies Relating to the Gospel of Matthew;

B. Other Studies Used.

The abbreviations employed are adopted from the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, or, if not found there, from the *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus*.

Full bibliographical details of works consulted, but not listed in this Bibliography, are given where they first occur in the footnotes. The page reference to this information may be found in the Index of Authors below.

A. STUDIES RELATING TO THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Abel, E. L., "Who Wrote Matthew?," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 138-152.

——— "The Genealogies of Jesus 'O ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 203-210.

Albright, W. F., and Mann, C. S., *Matthew*. AB 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971.

Allen, W.C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*. ICC. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Clark, 1912, repr. 1972.

Barbagli, P., "'Joseph, fili David, noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam' (Mt 1,20)," *Maria in Sacra Scriptura*. Vol. IV. *De Beata Virgine Maria in Evangeliis synopticis*. Romae: Pontificia Academia Mariana Internationalis, 1967. Pp. 445-463.

Barbour, R. S., "Uncomfortable Words: VIII. Status and Titles (Mt. 23,8-9)," *ExpTim* 82 (1970/71) 137-142.

Bardenhewer, O., *Maria Verkündigung. Ein Kommentar zu Lukas 1,26-38*. BibS(F) X,5. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1905.

Barr, D. L., "The drama of Matthew's Gospel: a reconsideration of its structure and purpose," *TD* 24 (1976) 349-359.

Bartina, S., "Y desde Egipto lo he proclamado hijo mío (Mt 2,15; Os 11,1)," *EstBib* 29 (1970) 157-160.

Beilner, W., "Die Kindheitsgeschichten der Evangelien," *TPQ* 117 (1969) 301-314.

Benoit, P., and Boismard, M-É, *Synopse des quatres évangiles en français*. Tome II. *Commentaire* (avec la collaboration de A. Lamouille et P. Sandevoir). Paris: Le Cerf, 1972

Benoit, P., *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*. BJ. 4th ed. Paris: Le Cerf, 1972.

Betz, O., "'Kann denn aus Nazareth etwas Gutes kommen?' (Zur Verwendung von Jesaia Kap. 11 in Johannes Kap. 1)," *Wort und Geschichte. Festschrift für Karl Elliger zum 70. Geburtstag*. Eds. H. Gese and H. P. Rüger. AOAT 18. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1973. Pp. 9-16.

Blair, E. P., *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1960.

Blinzler, J., "Die Heimat Jesu. Zu einer neuen Hypothese," *BK* 25 (1970) 14-20.

Bonnard, P., *L'Évangile selon saint Matthieu*. CNT 1. 2d ed. Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1970.

____ "Matthieu, éducateur du peuple chrétien," *Mélanges bibliques Béda Rigaux* (eds. A. Descamps, etc.). Pp. 1-7.

Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H. J., *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. London: SCM, 1963.

Bourke, M. M., "The Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," *CBQ* 22 (1960) 160-175.

Braude, W. G., "A Rabbinic Guide to the Gospels," *Scr* 19 (1967) 33-45.

Broer, I., "Die Bedeutung der 'Jungfrauengeburt' im Matthäusevangelium," *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 248-260.

Brosch, H. J., and Hasenfuss, J., eds., *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute*. Mariologische Studien, IV. Essen: Driewer, 1969.

Brown, R., *The Birth of the Messiah. A commentary on the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke*. New York (Garden City): Doubleday, 1977.

Brown, S., "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section (Mt 925-111)," *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73-90.

Brunner-Traut, E., "Die Geburtsgeschichte der Evangelien im Lichte ägyptologischer Forschungen," *ZRGG* 12 (1960) 97-111.

Bruns, J. E., "The Magi Episode in Matthew 2," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 51-54.

Bulbeck, R., "The Doubt of St. Joseph," *CBQ* 10 (1948) 296-309.

Cavalletti, S., "I sogni di San Giuseppe," *BeO* 2 (1960) 149-151.

Cave, C. H., "St. Matthew's Infancy Narrative," *NTS* 9 (1962/63) 382-390.

Charbel, A., "*Mt.* 2,1.7: I Magi erano Nabatei?," *RivB* 20 (1972) 571-583.

Christ, F., *Jesus Sophia. Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern*. ATANT 57. Zürich: Zwingli, 1970.

Christian, P., *Jesus und seine Geringsten Brüder: Mt 25,31-46 redaktionsgeschichtlich untersucht*. Erfurter Theologische Schriften, 12. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1975.

Clark, K. W., "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," *JBL* 66 (1947) 165-172.

Connolly, D., "Ad miracula sanationum apud Matthaeum," *VD* 45 (1967) 306-325.

Cope, O. Lamar, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. CBQMS 5. Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.

____ "The Death of John the Baptist in the Gospel of Matthew; or, the Case of the Confusing Conjunction," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 515-519.

Cothenet, É., "Les prophètes chrétiens dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu," *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Pp. 281-308.

Crossan, D. M., "Structure and Theology of Mt 1,18-2,23," *CahJos* 16 (1968) 119-135.

Danieli, G., "Matteo 1-2 e l'intenzione di narrare fatti accaduti," *RivB* 16 (1968) 187-199.

____ "L'influsso reciproco di tradizione e commenti profetici nel vangelo

di Matteo," *DThom* 71 (1968) 169-209.
Danieli, G., "A proposito delle origini della tradizione sinottica sulla concezione verginale," *DThom* 72 (1969) 312-331.
Daniélou, J., "l'Étoile de Jacob et la mission chrétienne à Damas," *VC* 11 (1957) 121-138.
____ *The Infancy Narratives*. A Compass Book. London: Burns & Oates, 1968.
Daube, D., "The Earliest Structures of the Gospels," *NTS* 5 (1958/59) 174-187.
Davies, W. D., *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.
Davis, C. T., "Tradition and Redaction in Matthew 1:18-2:23," *JBL* 90 (1971) 404-421.
Denis, A. M., "L'adoration des Mages vue par S. Matthieu," *NRT* 82 (1960) 32-39.
Derrett, J. Duncan M., "Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity," *NovT* 17 (1975) 81-108.
Descamps, A., "Le Christianisme comme justice dans le Premier Évangile," *ETL* 22 (1946) 5-33.
____ and de Halleux, A., *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.
____ "Rédaction et christologie dans le récit mathéen de la Passion," *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Pp. 359-415.
Dibelius, M., *Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Jahrgang 1931/32. 4. Abhandlung. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1932. Reprinted in his *Botschaft und Geschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1953. Band I. Pp. 1-78.
Didier, M., ed., *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie*. Journées bibliques de Louvain, 1970. BETL XXIX. Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
Dillon, R. J., "Towards a Tradition-History of the Parables of the True Israel (Matthew 21,33-22,14)," *Bib* 46 (1966) 1-42
____ "The Law of Christ and the Church of Christ according to Saint Matthew," *Communio* (Spokane) 2 (1975) 32-53.
Duling, D. C., "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David," *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-252.
____ "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic," *NTS* 24 (1977/78) 392-410.
Dupont, J., "Le point de vue de Matthieu dans le chapitre des paraboles." *L'Évangile de Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Pp. 221-259.
Ellis, P. F., *Matthew: His Mind and His Message*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1974.
Farmer, W. R., "Jesus and the Gospels: A Form-Critical and Theological Essay," *PSTJ* 28 (1975) 1-62.
Fenton, J. C., *The Gospel of St. Matthew*. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964.
Feuillet, A., "L'Esprit Saint et la Mère du Christ," *BSocFrEtMar* 25, Tome I, *L'évangile et les Pères*. Paris: Lethielleux, 1968. Pp. 39-64.
Fiedler, P., *Die Formel "und siehe" im Neuen Testament*. SANT 20. München:

Kösel, 1969.
Fitzmyer, J. A., "The Son of David Tradition and Matthew 22:41-46 and Parallels," *Conc* 10/2 (1966) 40-46. Repr. with slight additions in his *Essays on the Semitic Background*. Pp. 113-126.
—— "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament," *TS* 34 (1973) 541-575.
—— "The Matthean Divorce Texts and some New Palestinian Evidence," *TS* 37 (1976) 197-226.
Fohrer, G., (and W. von Martitz, E. Schweizer, E. Lohse, and W. Schneemelcher), "υἱός, υἱοθεσία," *TDNT* 8 (1969) 334-399, at pp. 340-354.
Ford, J. M., "'Thou art "Abraham" and Upon this Rock . . .'," *HeyJ* 6 (1965) 289-301.
—— "Mary's Virginitas Post-Partum and Jewish Law," *Bib* 54 (1973) 269-272.
Frank, K. S., Kilian, R., Lattke, G., and Rahner, K., *Zum Thema Jungfrauengeburt*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk (KBW), 1970.
Frankemölle, H., "Amtskritik im Matthäusevangelium," *Bib* 54 (1973) 247-262.
—— *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi. Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des "Evangeliums" nach Matthäus*. NTAbh 10. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974.
Fuchs, A., *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik*. AnBib 49. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
Gaechter, P., *Maria im Erdenleben. Neutestamentliche Studien*. Innsbruck/Wien/München: Tyrolia, 1953.
—— *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäusevangelium*. SBS 7. Stuttgart: KBW, n. d. (1965?).
—— "Die Magierperikope (Mt 2,1-12)," *ZKT* 90 (1968) 257-295.
Galbiati, E., "L'adorazione dei Magi (Matt. 2,1-12)," *BeO* 4 (1962) 20-29.
—— "Genere letterario e storia in Matteo 1-2," *BeO* 15 (1973) 3-16.
Gamba, G. G., "Annotazioni in margine alla struttura letteraria ed al significato dottrinale di Matteo 1-2," *BeO* 11 (1969) 5-24, 65-76, 109-123.
Gaston, L., "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles. *The Setting of Matthew's Christology*," *Int* 29 (1975) 24-40.
Geist, H., "Jesusverkündigung im Matthäusevangelium," *Jesus in den Evangelien. Ein Symposion*. Ed. W. Pesch. SBS 45. Stuttgart: KBW, 1970. Pp. 105-126.
Gerhardsson, B., *The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1-11 & par.). An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*. *ConB* NT Series 2:1. Lund: Gleerup, 1966.
—— "Jésus livré et abandonné d'après la Passion selon saint Matthieu," *RB* 76 (1969) 206-227
—— "Du Judéo-Christianisme à Jésus par le Shema'," *RSR* 60 (1972) 23-36.
—— "Gottes Sohn als Diener Gottes. Messias, Agape, und Himmelsherrschaft nach dem Matthäusevangelium," *ST* 27 (1973) 73-106.
Germano, J. M., "Nova et vetera in pericopam de sancto Joseph (Mt 1,18-25)," *VD* 46 (1968) 351-360.
—— "Privilegium nominis messianici a S. Joseph imponendi (Is 7,14; Mt 1, 21, 23, 25)," *VD* 47 (1969) 151-162.
Gese, H., "Natus ex virgine," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag*. Ed. H. W. Wolff. München: Christus Kaiser, 1971. Pp. 73-89.
Gibbs, J. M., "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'," *NTS* 10 (1963/64) 446-464.

Gibbs, J. M., "The Son of God as the Torah Incarnate in Matthew," *SE* IV. TU 102. Berlin: Akademie, 1968. Pp. 38-46.
—— "Mark 1,1-15, Matthew 1,1-4,16, Luke 1,1-4,30, John 1,1-51. The Gospel Prologues and their Function." *SE* VI. TU 112. Berlin: Akademie, 1973. Pp. 154-188.
Giblin, C. H., "Theological Perspective and Matthew 10:23b," *TS* 29 (1968) 637-661.
—— "Structural and Thematic Correlations in the Matthean Burial-Resurrection Narrative (Matt. xxvii.57-xxviii.20)," *NTS* 21 (1974/75) 406-420.
Glasson, T. F., "Davidic Links with the Betrayal of Judas," *ExpTim* 85 (1973/74) 118-119.
Gomá Civit, I., *El Evangelio según San Mateo*. 2 vols. Commentario al Nuevo Testamento, III/1-2. Colectanea San Paciano, 22/1-2. Istituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos. Madrid: Marova, 1966 [chs. 1-13], & 1976 [chs. 14-28].
Gordon, C. H., "Paternity at Two Levels," *JBL* 96 (1977) 101.
Goulder, M. D., *Midrash and Lection in Matthew. The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies [Oxford] 1969-71*. London: SPCK, 1974.
—— *The Evangelists' Calendar. A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture. The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies 1972*. London: SPCK, 1978.
Grassi, J., "The Resurrection and the Ezechiel Panel of the Dura-Europos Synagogue," *TBT* 11 (1964) 721-726.
Grayston, K., "Matthieu 1:18-25. Essai d'interprétation," *RTP* 23 (1973) 221-232.
Green, H. B., *The Gospel according to Matthew*. The New Clarendon Bible. Oxford: University Press, 1975.
Grelot, P., "La naissance d'Isaac et celle de Jésus. Sur une interprétation 'mythologique' de la conception virginale," *NRT* 104 (1972) 462-487, 561-585.
Grundmann, W., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. THKNT 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1968.
Gundry, R. H., *The Use of the Old Testament in Matthew's Gospel, with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. NovTSup 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
Gutbrod, K., *Die "Weihnachtsgeschichten" des Neuen Testaments*. Biblisches Seminar. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1971.
Hare, D. R. A., *The Theme of the Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew*. SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
Harrington, D. J., "Matthean Studies since Joachim Rohde," *HeyJ* 16 (1975) 375-388.
Hartman, L., "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication," *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Pp. 131-152.
Hayes, J. H., "The Resurrection as Enthronement and the Earliest Church Christology," *Int* 22 (1968) 333-345.
Heising, A., *Gott wird Mensch. Eine Einführung in die Aussageabsicht und Darstellungsweise von Mt 1-2; Lk 1-2; 3,23-38*. Trier: Zimmer, 1967.
Hendrickx, H., *The Infancy Narrative*. Manila: East Asian Pastoral Institute, 1975.
Hengel, M., and Merkel, H., "Die Magier aus dem Osten und die Flucht nach Ägypten (Mt 2) im Rahmen der antiken Religionsgeschichte und der

Theologie des Matthäus." *Orientierung an Jesus*. Eds. P. Hoffmann, etc. Pp. 139-169.
Hermans, L., *The Bible on the Childhood of Jesus*. London and Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1965.
Hill, D., "A Note on Matthew i.19," *ExpTim* 76 (1964/65) 133-134.
—— *The Gospel of Matthew*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants (Marshall, Morgan and Scott), 1972.
—— "False Prophets and Charismatics: Structure and Interpretation in Matthew 7,15-23," *Bib* 57 (1976) 327-348.
Hoffmann, P., Brox, N., and Pesch, W., eds., *Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Für Josef Schmid*. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1973.
Hofmans, F., "Maria altijd maagd," *ColBG* 8 (1962) 475-494; 9 (1963) 53-78.
Hubaut, M., "La parabole des vignerons homicides: son authenticité, sa visée première," *RTL* 6 (1975) 51-61.
Hubbard, B. J., *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
Hull, J. M., *Hellenistic Magic and the Gospel Tradition*. SBT 2/28. London: SCM, 1974.
Hummel, R., *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*. BEvT 33. 2d ed. München: Christus Kaiser, 1966.
Jeremias, J., "λίθος," *TDNT* 4 (1967 [German 1943]) 268-280.
—— "παῖς θεοῦ," *TDNT* 5 (1967 [German 1954]) 654-717.
—— *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. London: SCM, 1969.
Jerome, St., *Commentarium in S. Matthaeum*. Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteris Opera, Pars I, 7. CSEL 57. Turnholti: Brepols, 1969.
Johnson, M. D., *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogy of Jesus*. SNTSMS 8. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.
—— "Reflections on the Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 44-64.
Johnson, S. E., "The Davidic-Royal Motif in the Gospels," *JBL* 87 (1968) 136-150.
Jonge, M. de, "The Use of ὁ χριστός in the Passion Narratives (*Report of a Seminar*)," *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (ed. J. Dupont). Pp. 169-192.
Kilpatrick, J. D., *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.
Kingsbury, J. D., *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13. A Study in Redaction-Criticism*. London: SPCK, 1969.
—— *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
—— "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 95 (1976) 591-602.
—— "The Verb *Akolouthein* ('To Follow') as an Index of Matthew's View of his Community," *JBL* 97 (1978) 56-73.
Klostermann, E., *Das Matthäusevangelium*. HNT 4. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1927.
Knörzer, W., *Wir haben seinen Stern gesehen. Verkündigung der Geburt Christi nach Lukas und Matthäus*. Werkhefte zur Bibelarbeit, 11. Stuttgart: KBW, 1967.
Knox, W. L., *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Vol. II. *St. Luke and St. Matthew*. Ed. H. Chadwick. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Krämer, M., "Zwei Probleme aus Mt. 1,18-25," *Sal* 26 (1964) 303-333.
—— "Die Menschwerdung Jesu Christi nach Matthäus (Mt 1). Sein Anliegen und seines literarisches Verfahren," *Bib* 45 (1964) 1-50.
Kratz, R., *Auferweckung als Befreiung. Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus (besonders Mt 27,62-28,15).* SBS 65. Stuttgart: KBW, 1973.
Krentz, E., "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Towards the Structure of the First Gospel," *JBL* 83 (1964) 409-414.
Kruijf, Th. De, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums.* AnBib 16. Romae: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1962.
Kümmel, W. G., *Introduction to the New Testament.* 2d ed. London: SCM, 1975.
Lagrange, M. J., *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu.* 4th ed. EBib. Paris: Lecoffre/Gabalda, 1927.
Lange, J., *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Mattäus. Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mt 28,16-20.* ForBib 11. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973.
LaVerdiere, E. A., and Thompson, W. G., "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke," *TS* 37 (1976) 567-597.
Leonardi, G., *L'infanzia di Gesù nei vangeli di Matteo e di Luca.* Padova: Edizioni Messagero, 1975.
Léon-Dufour, X., "L'annonce à Joseph," *Études d'Évangile.* Collection "Parole de Dieu." Paris: Le Seuil, 1965. Pp. 67-81.
Leroy, H., "Sein Name wird sein Emmanuel. Die Kindheitsgeschichte nach Matthäus," *BK* 19 (1964) 110-117.
Lohmeyer, E., *Das Evangelium des Matthäus.* 4th ed. by W. Schmauch. MeyerK [KrExKomNT]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.
Lohr, C. H., "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 403-435.
Lohse, E., "υἱὸς Δαυίδ," *TDNT* 8 (1969) 478-488.
Lövestam, E., *Son and Saviour. A Study of Acts 13,32-37. With an Appendix: "Son of God" in the Synoptic Gospels.* ConNT 18. Lund: Gleerup, 1961.
—— "Davids-son-kristologin hos synoptikerna," *SEÅ* 37-38 (1972/73) 196-210. (French version in *ST* 28 [1974] 97-109).
Lovison, T., "La pericopa della Cananea *Mt.* 15,21-28," *RivB* 19 (1971) 273-305.
Luz, U., "Die Jünger im Matthäusevangelium," *ZNW* 62 (1971) 141-171.
McConnell, R. S., *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel. The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew.* Basel: Reinhardt, 1969.
McHugh, J., *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament.* London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1975.
M'Neile, A. H., *The Gospel according to St. Matthew.* London: Macmillan, 1915; 3rd repr. 1949.
Malina, B. (J.), "Matthew 2 and Is 41,2-3: a possible relationship?," *SBFLA* 17 (1967) 209-232.
—— "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. xxviii.16-20," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 87-103.
Manns, F., "La Halakah dans l'Évangile de Matthieu," *Anton* 53 (1978) 3-22.
Martin, F., "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Matthew," *ScEs* 27 (1975) 261-301.
Meier, J. P., *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of*

Mt. 5:17-48. AnBib 71. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
Meier, J. P., "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102.
—— "Two Disputed Questions in Matthew 28:16-20," *JBL* 96 (1977) 407-424.
Miguens, M., *The Virgin Birth: An Evaluation of Scriptural Evidence*. Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, 1975.
Milavec, A., "Matthew's Integration of Sexual and Divine Begetting," *BTB* 8 (1978) 108-116.
Milton, H., "The Structure of the Prologue to St. Matthew's Gospel," *JBL* 81 (1962) 175-181.
Minear, P. S., "The Interpreter and the Infancy Stories," *TTod* 7 (1950) 358-375.
Moraldi, L., "Qumraniana, *Nēṣer* e *Ṣemaḥ*," *RSO* 45 (1970) 209-216.
Munoz Iglesias, S., "El género literario del Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," *EstBib* 17 (1958) 243-273.
—— "El Evangelio de la Infancia en San Mateo," *Sacra Pagina. Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica*. Eds. A. Descamps, etc. BETL. Gembloux: Duculot, 1959. Pp. 121-149.
—— "Midrás y Evangelios de la Infancia," *EstE* 47 (1972) 331-359.
Murphy-O'Connor, J., "The Structure of Matthew XIV-XVII," *RB* 82 (1975) 360-384.
Neirynck, F., "La rédaction matthéenne et la structure du premier évangile," *ETL* 43 (1967) 41-73.
—— "Les Femmes au Tombeau: Étude de la rédaction Matthéenne (Matt. xxviii.1-10)," *NTS* 15 (1968/69) 168-190.
Nellessen, E., *Das Kind und seine Mutter. Struktur und Verkündigung des 2. Kapitels im Matthäusevangelium*. SBS 39. Stuttgart: KBW, 1969.
Nepper-Christensen, P., "Utugtsklausulen og Josef i Matthaeusevangeliet," *SEÅ* 34 (1969) 122-146.
—— *Das Matthäusevangelium. Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?* Acta Theologica Danica, 1. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958.
Neugebauer, F., "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii.35-7 parr.) und der Menschensohn," *NTS* 21 (1974/75) 81-108.
Nineham, D. E., "The Genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel and its Significance for the Study of the Gospels," *BJRL* 58 (1976) 421-444.
O'Neill, J. C., "The Silence of Jesus," *NTS* 15 (1968/69) 153-167.
Pascual Calvo, E., "La genealogía de Jesús según San Mateo," *EstBib* 23 (1964) 109-149.
Paul, A., *L'évangile de l'Enfance selon saint Matthieu*. Lire la Bible, 17. Paris: Le Cerf, 1968.
Peretto, E. M., "Ricerche su Mt 1-2," *Mar* 31 (1969) 140-247.
Pernot, H., *Les deux premiers chapitres de Matthieu et de Luc*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1948.
Perrot, C., "Les récits d'enfance dans la Haggada antérieure au IIe siècle de notre ère," *RSR* 55 (1967) 481-518.
Pesch, R., "Eine alttestamentliche Ausführungsformel im Matthäus-Evangelium. Redaktionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Beobachtungen," *BZ* 10 (1966) 220-245; 11 (1967) 79-95.
—— "Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1-2). Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Refexionszitate." *Bib* 48 (1967) 395-420.
Plummer, A., *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*. 5th ed. London: R. Scott, 1920.
Ponthot, J., "L'évangile de l'Enfance selon S. Matthieu. Perspectives doctrinales de Mt 1-2," *Revue Diocésaine de Tournai* 19 (1964) 615-637.

Pregeant, R., *Christology Beyond Dogma: Matthew's Christ in Process Hermeneutic.* SBL Semeia Supplements. Philadelphia/Missoula: Fortress/Scholars Press, 1978.
Proulx, P., and Alonso Schökel, L., "Las Sandalias del Mesías Esposo," *Bib* 59 (1978) 1-37.
Radermakers, J., *Au fil de l'évangile selon saint Matthieu.* 1. *Texte.* 2. *Lecture continue.* Heverlee-Louvain: Institut d'Etudes Théologiques, 1972.
Räisänen, H., *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament.* Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B., Tom. 158. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1969.
Ramaroson, L., "La structure du premier évangile," *ScEs* 26 (1974) 69-112.
Rasco, E., "Mt I-II: Structure, Meaning, Reality," *SE* IV/1. TU 102. Berlin: Akademie, 1968. Pp. 214-230.
Reumann, J., "'Jesus the Steward.' An Overlooked Theme in Christology," *SE* V. Berlin: Akademie, 1968. Pp. 21-29.
—— "Psalm 22 at the Cross. Lament and Thanksgiving for Jesus Christ," *Int* 28 (1974) 39-58.
Riedl, J., *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu. Die Heilsbotschaft von Mt 1-2 und Lk 1-2.* Biblisches Forum, 3. Stuttgart: KBW, 1968.
Rosenberg, R. A., "The 'Star of the Messiah' Reconsidered," *Bib* 53 (1972) 105-109.
Rothfuchs, W., *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung.* BWANT 88. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969.
Sabourin, L., *Il vangelo di Matteo: Teologia e Esegesi.* 2 vols. [Rome:] Edizioni Paoline, 1976 [chs. 1-7], 1977 [chs. 8-28].
—— "The Bible and Christ: The Unity of the Two Testaments," *BTB* 8 (1978) 77-85.
Salas, A., *La infancia de Jesús (Mt 1-2): historia o teología?* Biblioteca Escuela Bíblica, 1. Madrid: Ed. "Biblia y Fe," 1976.
Schlatter, A., *Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, sein Selbständigkeit.* 6th ed. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963.
Schmid, J., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* RNT 1. 5th ed. Regensburg: Pustet, 1965.
Schniewind, J., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* NTD I/1. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1937.
Schubert, K., *Jésus à la lumière du Judaïsme du premier siècle.* LD 84. Paris: Le Cerf, 1974.
Schweizer, E., "πνεῦμα, κτλ.," *TDNT* 6 (1959) 332-445, at pp. 389-455.
—— "υἱός," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 334-399, at pp. 354-357, 363-392.
—— "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew," *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 213-230.
—— *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* NTD 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973. English trans.: *The Good News according to Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1976).
—— *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde.* SBS 71. Stuttgart: KBW, 1974.
Senior, D., *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study.* BETL 39. Gembloux: Duculot, 1975.
Soares Prabhu, G. M., *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew. An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt 1-2.* AnBib 63. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
Soubigou, A., "L'évangile de l'enfance selon saint Matthieu," *Année Théologique* 9 (1948) 82-94.
Speyer, W., "Genealogie," *RAC* 9 (1976), cols. 1145-1268, esp. 1223-1232.

Spicq, C., "'Joseph, son mari, étant juste . . . ' (Mt I,19)," *RB* 71 (1964) 206-214.
Spinetoli, O. da, *Introduzione ai Vangeli dell'Infanzia.* Esegesi Biblica, 2. Brescia: Paideia, 1967.
—— "Bolletino di Mariologia Biblica: Esegesi e Mariologia biblica postconciliare," *EphMar* 20 (1970) 205-225.
Stanton, G. N., "5 Ezra and Matthean Christianity in the Second Century," *JTS* 28 (1977) 67-83.
Stauffer, E., "Jeschu ben Mirjam. Kontroversgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu Mk 6:3," *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black.* Eds. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: Clark, 1969. Pp. 119-128.
Stegemann, H., "'Die des Uria': Zur Bedeutung der Frauennamen in der Genealogie von Matthäus 1,1-17," *Tradition und Glaube. Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag.* Eds. G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971. Pp. 246-276.
Stendahl, K., "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Mt. 1-2," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias.* Ed. W. Eltester. BZNW 26. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960; 2nd ed. 1964. Pp. 94-105.
—— *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament.* ASNU 20. 2nd ed. with a New Preface. Lund: Gleerup, n. d. (1968).
Stramare, T., "I sogni di S. Giuseppe," *CahJos* 19 (1971) 104-122.
—— "Giuseppe 'uomo giusto' in Mt. 1,18-25," *RivB* 21 (1973) 287-300.
Strecker, G., *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus.* FRLANT 82. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966.
Suggs, M. J., *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel.* Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1970.
Suhl, A., "Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium," *ZNW* 59 (1968) 57-81.
Tagawa, K., "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 149-162.
Tatum, W. Barnes, "'The Origin of Jesus Messiah' (Matt 1:1, 18a): Matthew's Use of the Infancy Traditions," *JBL* 96 (1977) 523-535.
Tavares, A. A., "A Concepção virginal em Mt. 1 e o seu significado," *Estudios Josefinos* (Valladolid) 30 (1976) 3-18.
Thompson, W. G., *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community, Mt. 17,22-18,35.* AnBib 44. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970.
—— "An Historical Perspective in the Gospel of Matthew." *JBL* 93 (1974) 243-262.
—— "Reflections on the Composition of Mt 8:1-9:34," *CBQ* 33 (1974) 365-388.
—— "New Testament Communities," - see LaVerdiere, E. A.
Thornton, L. S., *The Form of the Servant.* Vol. II. *The Dominion of Christ.* London: Black/Dacre Press, 1952.
Thysman, R., *Communauté et directives éthiques. La catéchèse de Matthieu.* RechSynEx 1. Gembloux: Duculot, 1974.
Trilling, W., *Das wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-evangeliums.* SANT 10. 3rd ed. München: Kösel, 1964.
Trudinger, L. O., "Davidic Links with the Betrayal of Jesus: Some Further Observations," *ExpTim* 86 (1974/75) 278-279.
Vanhoye, A., *Structure and Theology of the Accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels.* *TBT* Supplementary Series, 1. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1967.

Van Segbroeck, F., "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents," *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Pp. 107-130.
Van Tilborg, S., *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
Vargas-Machuca, A., "(Καὶ) ἰδού en el estilo narrativo de Mateo," *Bib* 50 (1969) 233-244.
Vermes, G., *Jesus the Jew. A historian's reading of the Gospels*. London: Collins, 1973.
Vicent Cernuda, A., "La dialéctica γεννῶ-τίκτω en Mt 1-2," *Bib* 55 (1974) 408-417.
Vögtle, A., "Die Genealogie Mt 1,2-16 und die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," *BZ* 8 (1964) 45-58, 239-262; 9 (1965) 32-49.
—— "Das Schicksal des Messiaskindes. Zur Auslegung und Theologie von Mt 2," *BibLeb* 6 (1965) 246-279.
—— "Mt 1,25 und die 'Virginitas B. M. Virginis post partum,'" *TQ* 147 (1967) 28-39.
—— "Offene Fragen zur lukanischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte," *BibLeb* 11 (1970) 51-67.
—— *Messias und Gottessohn. Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte*. Theologische Perspektiven. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.
—— "Die matthäische Kindheitsgeschichte," *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier). Pp. 153-183.
Waetjen, W. C., "The Genealogy as the Key to the Gospel according to Matthew," *JBL* 95 (1976) 205-230.
Walker, R., *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*. FRLANT 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.
Walker, W. O., "A Method for Identifying Redactional Passages in Matthew on Functional and Linguistic Grounds," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 76-93.
Wijngaards, J. N. M., "The Episode of the Magi and Christian Kerygma," *IndJT* 16 (1967) 30-41.
Winandy, J., *Autour de la naissance de Jésus. Accomplissement et prophétie*. Lire La Bible, 26. Paris: Le Cerf, 1970.
Zahn, T., *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, I. 4th ed. Leipzig-Erlangen: Deichert, 1922.
Zakowitch, Y., "Rahab als Mutter des Boas in der Jesu-Genealogie," *NovT* 17 (1975) 1-5.
Zani, L., *"Abbiamo visto la sua stella." Studio su Mt 2,1-12*. Excerpta ex dissertatione ad Lauream in Facultate Theologiae Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae. Padova: (Tipografia Antoniana), 1973.
Zinniker, F., *Probleme der sogenannten Kindheitsgeschichte bei Matthäus*. Freiburg i. Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1972.
Zuckschwerdt, E., "Nazōraîos in Matth. 2,23," *TZ* 31 (1975) 65-77.
Zumstein, J., *La condition du croyant dans l'évangile selon Matthieu*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 16. Fribourg/Göttingen: Editions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977.

B. OTHER STUDIES USED

Ackroyd, P. R., and Evans, C. F., eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible.* Vol. I, *From the Beginnings to Jerome.* Cambridge: University Press, 1970.

Allen, L. C., "The Old Testament Background of (προ) ὁρίζειν in the New Testament," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 104-108.

Amsler, S., *David, roi et messie. La Tradition Davidique dans l'Ancien Testament.* Cahiers théologiques, 49. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963.

Aptowitzer, V., *Parteipolitik der Hasmonäerzeit im rabbinischen und pseudepigraphischen Schrifttum.* Veröffentlichungen der Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, Band V. Wien: Verlag der Kohut-Foundation, 1927.

Attridge, H. W., *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the* Antiquitates Biblicae *of Flavius Josephus.* HDR 7. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976

Audet, J.-P., *La Didachè. Instruction des Apôtres.* EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1958.

Bagatti, B., *L'Église de la circoncision.* Publications du SBF, Collection minor, 2. Jérusalem: Imprimerie des Pères Franciscains, 1965.

—— "I 'parenti del Signore' a Nazareto," *BeO* 7 (1965) 259-263.

—— "I Giudeo-Cristiani e l'anello di Salomone," *RSR* 60 (1972) 151-160.

Bauckham, R., "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology," *SJT* 31 (1978) 245-260.

Beauchamp, P., "La figure dans l'un et l'autre Testament," *RSR* 59 (1971) 209-224.

—— "Jésus-Christ n'est pas seul. L'accomplissement des Écritures dans la Croix," *RSR* 65 (1977) 243-278.

Becker, Joachim, *Messiaserwartung im Alten Testament.* SBS 83. Stuttgart: KBW, 1977.

Becker, Jürgen, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen.* Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, III/1. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974.

Beggiani, S., "Mythological and Ontological Elements in Early Christology," *Does Jesus Make a Difference? Proceedings of the College Theological Society.* Ed. T. M. McFadden. A Crossroad Book. New York: Seabury, 1974. Pp. 20-43.

Bentzen, A., *King and Messiah.* 2d ed. by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.

Berger, K., "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Titel," *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 391-425.

—— "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 1-44.

—— "Zum Problem der Messianität Jesu," *ZTK* 71 (1974) 1-30.

Beskow, P., *Rex Gloriae. The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church.* Stockholm/Göteborg/Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962.

Betz, O., *What do we know about Jesus?* London: SCM, 1968.

Black, M., "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1971/72) 1-14.

Bloch, R., "Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique," *Cahiers Sioniens* 8 (1954) 210-285.

Borsch, F. H., *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. NT Library. London: SCM, 1967.
Brownlee, W. H., "Psalms 1-2 as a Coronation Liturgy," *Bib* 52 (1971) 321-336.
Bruce, F. F., ed., *Promise and Fulfilment. Essays presented to Professor S. H. Hooke in celebration of his ninetieth birthday, 21st January 1964 by members of the Society for O.T. Study and others*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1963.
Brueggemann, W., "David and His Theologian," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 156-181.
—— "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2,23a)," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 532-542.
—— "Kingship and Chaos (A Study in Tenth Century Theology)," *CBQ* 33 (1971) 317-332.
—— "Weariness, Exile and Chaos (A Motif in Royal Theology)," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 19-38.
—— "From Hurt to Joy, From Death to Life," *Int* 28 (1974) 3-19.
Buchanan, G. W., *The Consequences of the Covenant*. NovTSup 20. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
Burger, C., *Jesus als Davidssohn. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. FRLANT 98. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970.
Byrne, F. J., *Irish Kings and High-Kings*. London: Batsford, 1973.
Cantalamessa, R., "La primitiva esegesi cristologica di Romani I,3-4," *RStorLetRel* 2 (1966) 69-80.
Cazelles, H., Drioton, É., Largement, R., and Michel, A., "Nouvel An (Fête du)," *DBSup* 6 (1960), cols. 555-645.
Charlesworth, J. H., ed. and trans., *The Odes of Solomon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.
Chevallier, M.-A., *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, 49. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1958.
Childs, B. S., "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis," *JSS* 16 (1971) 137-150.
Clements, R. E., *Abraham and David. Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition*. SBT 2/5. London: SCM, 1967.
Clines, D. J. A., "New Year," *IDBSup* (1976) 625-629.
Collins, J. J., *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBLDS 13. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
—— "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment," *BASOR* 220 (1975) 27-36.
—— *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. HSM 16. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
Coppens, J., *Le messianisme royal: Ses origines. Son développement. Son accomplissement*. LD 54. Paris: Le Cerf, 1968.
—— *Le Messianisme et sa Relève prophétique: Les anticipations vétéro-testamentaires. Leur accomplissement en Jésus*. BETL 38. Gembloux: Duculot, 1974.
Cross, F. L., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
Daniélou, J., *The Development of Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*. Vol. 1, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Trans. and ed. by J. A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
Davies, W. D., *The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1974.
Delcor, M., *Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)*. "Autour de la Bible." Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962.

M. Delcor, "Psaumes de Salomon," *DBSup* 9 (1973), cols. 214-245.
Delling, G., "ὕμνος, κτλ.," *TDNT* 8 (1969) 489-503.
Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques.* Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1867; repr. 1971.
Derrett, J. Duncan M., "'The Stone that the Builders Rejected,'" *SE* 4. Berlin: Akademie, 1968. Pp. 180-186.
Dietzfelbinger, C., *Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae (Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum).* Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, II/2. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975.
Díez Macho, A., *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense, Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana.* Tomo II, *Éxodo*; Tomo III, *Levítico*; Tomo III, *Números.* Textos y Estudios, 8-10. Madrid/Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1970, 1971, 1974.
Donahue, J. R., "Temple, Trial, and Royal Christology," *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16.* Ed. W. H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. Pp. 61-79.
Drury, J., *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel. A Study in Early Christian Historiography.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976.
Duling, D. C., "The Promises to David and their Entrance into Christianity - Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 55-77.
Dumais, M., *Le langage de l'évangélisation. L'annonce missionaire en milieu juif.* Recherches 16 *Théologie.* Paris-Tournai/Montréal: Desclée/Bellarmin, 1976.
Dumortier, J.-B., "Un rituel d'intronisation: le Ps. LXXXIX 2-38," *VT* 22 (1972) 176-196.
Dunn, J. D. G., *Jesus and the Spirit. A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament.* NT Library. London: SCM, 1975.
Dupont, J., "La destinée de Judas prophetisée par David (Actes 1,16-20)," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 41-51.
——— , ed., *Jésus aux origines de la christologie.* BETL 40. Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven University Press, 1975.
Eaton, J. H., *Kingship and the Psalms.* SBT 2/32. London: SCM, 1976.
Ellis, E. E., "Midrash, Targum and the New Testament Quotations," *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (ed. E. E. Ellis [see under E. Stauffer]). Pp. 61-69.
Fawcett, T., *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel.* London: SCM, 1973.
Finkelstein, L., "The Oldest Midrash: Pre-Rabbinic Ideals and Teachings in the Passover Haggadah," *HTR* 31 (1938) 291-317.
Fitzgerald, A., "The Mythological Background for the Presentation of Jerusalem as a Queen and False Worship as Adultery in the Old Testament," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 403-416.
Fitzmyer, J. A., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament.* London: Chapman, 1971.
——— "David, 'Being Therefore a Prophet . . . ' (Acts 2,30)," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 332-339.
——— "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament," *TS* 34 (1973) 541-575.
——— "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 382-407.
Freedman, D. N., "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry," *JBL* 96 (1977) 5-26.
Freedman, H., and Simon, M., eds., *Midrash Rabbah Translated into English*

with Notes, Glossary and Indices. 10 vols. London: Soncino, 1939; 3rd repr. 1961.

Fuller, R. H., *The Foundations of New Testament Christology.* Lutterworth Library. London: Lutterworth, 1965. Reissued in the Fontana Library, London: Collins, 1969.

Gadamer, H. G., *Truth and Method.* London: Sheed and Ward, 1975.

Gaston, L., *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels.* NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Goldfahn, A. H., "Justinus Martyr und die Agada," *MGWJ* 22 [N.F. 5] (1873) 49-60, 104-115, 145-153, 194-202, 257-269.

Goulder, M. D., "The Fourth Book of the Psalter," *JTS* 26 (1975) 269-289.

Gray, J., "The Day of Yahweh in Cultic Experience and Eschatological Prospect," *SEÅ* 39 (1974) 5-37.

Greenwood, D. C., "On the Jewish Hope for a Restored Northern Kingdom," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 376-385.

Grego, I., "I Giudeo-Cristiani alla luce degli ultimi Studi e dei recenti reperti archeologici," *Sal* 40 (1978) 125-149.

Grundmann, W., Hesse, F., de Jonge, M., van der Woude, A., "χρίω, χριστός, κτλ.," *TDNT* 9 (1973) 493-580.

Gurewicz, S. B., "Hebrew Apocryphal Psalms from Qumran," *AusBR* 15 (1967) 13-20.

Habel, N. C., "'He Who Stretches Out the Heavens,'" *CBQ* 34 (1972) 417-430.

—— "The Symbolism of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9," *Int* 26 (1972) 131-157.

Hahn, F., *The Titles of Jesus in Christology. Their History in Early Christianity.* Lutterworth Library. London: Lutterworth, 1969.

Halpern, B., "The Ritual Background of Zechariah's Temple Song," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 167-190.

Hamerton-Kelly, R. G., "The temple and the origins of Jewish apocalyptic," *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15.

Hammerschmidt, E., "Königsideologie im spätantiken Judentum," *ZDMG* 113 [N.F. 38] (1963) 493-511.

Hanson, A. T., *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology.* London: SPCK, 1974.

Harrington, D. J., Cazeaux, J., Perrot, Ch., and Bogaert, P. M., *Pseudo-Philon. Les Antiquités Bibliques.* 2 vols. SC 229, 230. Paris: Le Cerf, 1976.

Hengel, M., *The Son of God. The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion.* London: SCM, 1976.

Herr, M. D., "Midrash," *EncJud* 11 (1971), cols. 1507-1514.

Hill, D., *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings. Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms.* SNTSMS 5. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.

—— "'Son of Man' in Psalm 80 v. 17," *NovT* 15 (1973) 261-269.

Hoffmann, A., *Namensdeutung zur Wesensdeutung.* BWANT 100. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973.

Howton, J., "'Son of God' in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 10 (1963/64) 227-237.

Ihromi, "Die Königinmutter und der *'amm ha'arez* im Reich Juda," *VT* 24 (1974) 421-429.

Ishida, T., *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel. A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology.* BZAW 142. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1977.

Jaubert, A., *La notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne.* Patristica Sorbonensia, 6. Paris: Le Seuil, 1963.

—— "Symboles et figures christologiques dans le judaïsme," *RevScRel* 47 (1973) 373-390.

Jones, G. H., "The Decree of Yahweh (Ps II 7)," *VT* 15 (1965) 336-344.
Juel, D., *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.* SBLDS 31. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
Kantorowicz, E. H., *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology.* Princeton: University Press, 1957.
Kasper, W., *Jesus the Christ.* London/New York: Burns & Oates/Paulist Press, 1976.
Kearney, P. J., "Gen 3:15 and Johannine Theology," *Marian Studies* 27 (1976) 99-109.
Kee, H. C., *Community of the New Age. Studies in Mark's Gospel.* NT Library. London: SCM, 1977.
Kenik, H. A., "Code of Conduct for a King: Psalm 101," *JBL* 95 (1976) 391-403.
King, N. Q., "Kingship as Communication and Accomodation," *Promise and Fulfilment* (ed. F. F. Bruce). Pp. 142-162.
Kuhn, K. G., *Sifre zu Numeri.* Rabbinsiche Texte, Zweite Reihe. Tannaitische Midraschim. Band 3. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1959.
Le Déaut, R., *La nuit pascale. Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42.* AnBib 22. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.
—— "Pentecôte et la tradition juive," *AsSeign* 51 (1963) 22-38.
—— "Miryam, soeur de Moïse, et Marie, mère du Messie," *Bib* 45 (1964) 198-219.
—— *Introduction à la littérature targumique.* I. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1966.
—— "A propos d'une définition du midrash," *Bib* 50 (1969) 395-413. (English version in *Int* 25 [1971] 259-282).
—— "Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne: 'le targumisme,'" *Bib* 52 (1971) 505-525.
——, and Robert, J., *Targum des Chroniques. Tome I, Introduction et Traduction; Tome II, Texte et Glossaire.* AnBib 51. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971.
Limbeck, M., *Die Ordnung des Heils. Untersuchungen zum Gesetzesverständnis des Frühjudentums.* KomBeiANT. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.
L'Hour, J., "'Yahweh Elohim,'" *RB* 81 (1974) 524-556.
Lindars, B., *New Testament Apologetic. The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations.* London: SCM, 1961.
Lipiński, E., *Le poème royal du Ps. LXXXIX 1-5, 20-38.* Cahiers de la *RB*, 6. Paris: Gabalda, 1967.
—— "Recherches sur le livre de Zacharie," *VT* 20 (1970) 25-55.
Lohmeyer, E., *Gottesknecht und Davidssohn.* FRLANT 61. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1953.
Longenecker, R. N., *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity.* SBT 2/17. London: SCM, 1970.
Luzzaraga, J., "La función docente del Mesías en el Cuarto Evangelio," *EstBib* 32 (1973) 119-136.
McCarthy, D. J., *Old Testament Covenant. A Survey of Current Opinions.* Growing Points in Theology. Oxford: Blackwell, 1972.
McKay, J. W., "Man's Love for God in Deuteronomy and the Father/Teacher-Son/Pupil Relationship," *VT* 22 (1972) 426-435.
McKelvey, R. J., *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament.* Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: University Press, 1969.
MacLaurin, E. C. B., "Joseph and Asaph," *VT* 25 (1975) 27-45.
McNamara, M., *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch.* AnBib 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

Mauchline, J., "Implicit signs of a persistent belief in the Davidic Empire," *VT* 20 (1970) 287-303.
Maurer, C., "ῥίζα," *TDNT* 6 (1968 [German 1959]) 985-990.
Meeks, W. A., *The Prophet-King. Moses Tradition and Johannine Christology.* NovTSup 14. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
Mendenhall, G. E., *The Tenth Generation. The Origins of the Biblical Tradition.* Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
Mettinger, T., *King and Messiah. The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite King.* ConB, OT series 8. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.
Miller, J. M., "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," *JBL* 91 (1972) 289-304.
Miller, M. P., "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 29-82.
Moloney, F. J., "The Targum of Ps. 8 and the New Testament," *Sal* 37 (1975) 326-336.
Moule, C. F. D., *The Origin of Christology.* Cambridge: University Press, 1977.
Mowinckel, S., *He That Cometh.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.
Müller, K., "Menschensohn und Messias. Religionsgeschichtliche Vorüberlegungen zum Menschensohnproblem in den synoptischen Evangelien," *BZ* 16 (1972) 161-187; 17 (1973) 52-66.
Murray, R., *Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study in Early Syriac Tradition.* Cambridge: University Press, 1975.
Neugebauer, F., "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii,35-37 parr.) und der Menschensohn," *NTS* 21 (1974/75) 81-108.
Neusner, J., *A Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai Ca. 1-80 C.E.* 2d ed. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
Newsome, J. D., "Towards a New Understanding of the Chronicler and His Purposes," *JBL* 94 (1975) 201-217.
Nickelsburg, G. W. E., *Studies on the Testament of Joseph.* SBLSCS 5. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
O'Collins, G., "Theological Trends: Jesus in Current Theology, II," *The Way* 17 (1977) 51-64.
Pannenberg, W., *Jesus - God and Man.* The Library of Philosophy and Theology. London: SCM, 1968.
Penna, R., *Lo Spirito di Cristo. Cristologia e pneumatologia secondo un'originale formulazione paolina.* SupplRBib(It) 7. Brescia: Paideia, 1976.
Petitjean, A., "La Mission de Zorobabel et la Reconstruction du Temple," *ETL* 42 (1966) 40-71.
Philonenko, M., "Remarques sur un hymne essénien de caractère gnostique," *Sem* 11 (1961) 43-54.
Porteous, N. W., "Royal Wisdom," *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley.* Eds. M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. VTSup 3. Leiden: Brill, 1955. Pp. 247-261.
Poulssen, N., *König und Tempel im Glaubenszeugnis des Alten Testamentes.* SBM 3. Stuttgart: KBW, 1967.
Prigent, P., *Justin et l'Ancien Testament.* EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1964.
—— "In Principio. A Propos d'un livre récent," *RHPR* 54 (1974) 391-399.
Rahner, K., "The Theology of the Symbol," *Theological Investigations* IV. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1966 (German 1959). Pp. 221-252.
Randellini, L., *La Chiesa dei Giudeo-Cristiani.* Studi Biblici, 1. Brescia: Paideia, 1968.
Reese, J. M., *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences.* AnBib 41. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970.

Riesenfeld, H., "The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology," *The Gospel Tradition. Essays by Harald Riesenfeld.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1970 (originally 1956).
Robinson, J. M., and Koester, H., *Trajectories through Early Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
Rostovtzeff, M., *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire.* Vol. I. 2d ed. revised by P. M. Frazer. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.
Rowley, H. H., "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah," *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays.* 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965. Pp. 65-93.
Ruggieri, G., *Il Figlio di Dio davidico. Studio sulla storia delle tradizioni contenute in Rom. 1,3-4.* Anal. Gregor 166. Roma: Università Gregoriana, 1968.
Rylaarsdam, J. Coert, "Jewish-Christian Relationship: The Two Covenants and the Dilemmas of Christology," *JES* 9 (1971/72) 249-270.
Safrai, S., and Stern, M., eds., in co-operation with D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik. *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural, and Religious Life and Institutions.* Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section I, Vol. 1. General eds. M. de Jonge and S. Safrai. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974.
Saliba, J. A., "The Virgin-Birth Debate in Anthropological Literature: A Critical Assessment," *TS* 36 (1975) 428-454.
Sanders, J. A., ed., *The Psalm Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^{a}).* DJD 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
Sawyer, J. F. A., "An Analysis of the Content and Meaning of the Psalm-Headings," *GlasgOrTrans* 22 (1967/68) 26-38.
Schäfer, P., *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur.* SANT 28. München: Kösel, 1972.
Schalit, A., *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk.* Studia Judaica, 4. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969.
Schlisske, W., *Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament. Phasen der Entmythologisierung im Alten Testament.* BWANT 97. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973.
Schneider, G., "Zur Vorgeschichte des christologischen Prädikats 'Sohn Davids,'" *TTZ* 80 (1971) 247-253.
—— "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk 12,35-37)," *Bib* 53 (1972) 65-90.
Schoeps, H.-J., *Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135).* Vol. I. New English trans. revised and ed. by G. Vermes and F. Millar. Edinburgh: Clark, 1973.
Schürmann, H., *Das Lukasevangelium. Erster Teil. Kommentar zu Kap; 1,1-9,50.* HTKNT III/1. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1969.
Schweizer, E., "The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and its Old Testament Background," *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays presented in honor of Paul Schubert.* Eds. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. London: SPCK, 1968. Pp. 186-193.
Seybold, K., *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten.* FRLANT 107. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1972.
—— "Spätprophetische Hoffnungen auf die Wiederkunft des davidischen Zeitalters in Sach 9-14," *Judaica* 29 (1973) 99-111.
Sheehan, J. F. X., "Sacral Kingship and the New Testament," *TBT* 82 (1976) 677-682.
Skehan, P. W., "The Apocryphal Psalm 151," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 407-409.

Skehan, P. W., "Again the Syrian Apocryphal Psalms," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 143-158.
Sperber, D., "On Sealing the Abysses," *JSS* 11 (1966) 168-174.
Stegemann, H., "Weitere Stücke von 4QpPsalm 37, von 4 QPatriarchal Blessings, und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Excerpten aus dem Deuteronomium," *RevQ* 6 (1967/68) 193-227.
Strugnell, J., "More Psalms of 'David,'" *CBQ* 27 (1965) 207-216.
Terrien, S., "The Omphalos Myth and Hebrew Religion," *VT* 20 (1970) 315-338.
Theissen, G., *The First Followers of Jesus. A Sociology of Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM, 1978.
Tournay, R., "Zacharie XII-XIV et l'histoire d'Israël," *RB* 81 (1974) 355-374.
Tulloch, J. C., "Sociology of knowledge and the sociology of literature," *The British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976) 197-210.
Tur-Sinai, I., "David (In the Aggadah)," *EncJud* 5 (1971), cols. 1318-1338.
Urbach, E. E., *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975.
van Cangh, J.-M., "La Galilée dans l'évangile de Marc: un lieu théologique," *RB* 79 (1972) 59-75.
Vaulx, J. de, "Maison de David, Maison de Dieu," *AsSeign* 8 (1972) 28-33.
Vermes, G., *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. SBS 4. 2d slightly revised ed. Leiden: Brill, 1973 (1st ed. 1961).
Vööbus, A., *Liturgical Traditions in the Didache*. Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 16. Stockholm: ETSE, 1968.
Weinfeld, W., "Covenant, Davidic," *IDBSup* (1976) 188-192.
Weisman, Z., "Anointing as a Motif in the Making of the Charismatic King," *Bib* 57 (1976) 378-398.
Whitley, C. F., "Deutero-Isaiah's Interpretation of *ṣedeq*," *VT* 22 (1972) 469-475.
Widengren, G., "Royal Ideology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Promise and Fulfilment* (ed. F. F. Bruce). Pp. 202-212.
Wifall, W., "Israel's Covenant Wisdom," *TBT* 64 (1973) 1046-1052.
—— "The Breath of His Nostrils: Gen 2:7b," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 237-240.
—— "David - Prototype of Israel's Future?," *BTB* 4 (1974) 94-107.
—— "Gen 3:15 - A Protevangelium?," *CBQ* 36 (1974) 361-365.
—— "Son of Man - A Pre-Davidic Social Class?," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 331-340.
Williamson, H. G. M., "'The Sure Mercies of David': Subjective or Objective Genitive?," *JSS* 23 (1978) 31-49.
Yadin, Y., "The Temple Scroll," *BA* 30 (1967) 135-139.
Zedda, S., "Un aspetto della cristologia di Luca: il titolo *Kyrios* in Lc 1-2 e nel resto del III Vangelo," *RasT* 13 (1972) 305-315.
Zenger, F., "Die deuteronomistische Interpretation der Rehabilitierung Jojachins," *BZ* 12 (1968) 16-30.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

INDEX OF BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS

SELECTIVE INDEX TO QUOTATIONS FROM QUMRAN, THE PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, AND OTHER ANCIENT WRITINGS

INDEX OF SUBJECTS